Maya Birdwood-Hedger

Tension between Domestication and Foreignization In English-language Translations Of *Anna Karenina*

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Edinburgh

2006

Declaration

I hereby declare that this submission is my own work and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due acknowledgement has been made in the text. It has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification except as specified.

Maya Birdwood-Hedger

2 October 2006

Abstract

One of the key issues in recent translation theories has been on whether translation should domesticate or foreignize the source text.

Venuti (1995) defines domesticating translation as a replacement of the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text with a text that is intelligible to the target-language reader. Foreignizing translation is defined as a translation that indicates the linguistic and cultural differences of the text by disrupting the cultural codes that prevail in the target language. Other scholars, like Tymoczko (1999), criticise this dichotomy by pointing out that a translation may be radically oriented to the source text in some respects, but depart radically from the source text in other respects, thus denying the existence of the single polarity that describes the orientation of a translation.

For my research I have chosen five English translations of Lev Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina,* covering over a century of the history of translations into English*:* Dole (1886), Garnett (1901), Maude (1918), Edmonds (1954) and Pevear and Volokhonsky (2000).

My main objective has been to analyse the relationship between earlier and later translations. Since modern English language readers are more familiar with Russian language, literature and culture as well as with Tolstoy's works than the 19th century readers were, theoretically speaking, translating Tolstoy in 2000 should be easier than it was in 1886. In reality each translator still had to choose between the adequate representation of Tolstoy's text and the acceptability of their translation for their contemporary English speaking audiences (the terms described in Toury 1995) on a sliding scale between audience and text. In a way, with the higher development of the art and scholarship of translation, the expectations of readers and critics grow, and adequate representation of a text in a different language becomes more challenging. My hypothesis is that literary translation evolves as an exploration of deeper and deeper layers of the source text. In the present thesis I try to show how the history of translation of *Anna Karenina* into English reflects these different stages of evolution.

Table of contents

Abstract

Table of contents 4

Introduction 6

Chapter 1: Domestication and Foreignization in the History of English Translations.10

1.1. History of the theory of translation. 10
1.2. Domestication in early translations in England. 12
1.3. Domestication in early translation theories. 14
1.4. Fluency technique and alternative translation strategies in the 17th-18th centuries. 22
1.5. Victorian Age and Foreignization. 27
1.6. Early 20th century theory and practice in Britain and America. 35
1.7. Alternative points of view. 39
1.8. Theory and practice in the 1960s. 42
1.9. The cultural turn in translation studies. 47
1.10. Criticism of Venuti's theory of domestication and foreignization. 56

Chapter 2: History of translation of *Anna Karenina* into English. 69

2.1. Introduction. 70
2.2. Nathan Dole. 71
2.3. Constance Garnett. 75
2.4. Leo Wiener. 81
2.5. Rochel Townsend. 82
2.6. Louise and Aylmer Maude's translation. 82
2.7. Rosemary Edmonds. 88
2.8. Joel Carmichael. 94
2.9. Margaret Wettlin. 95
2.10. Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky 96
2.11. Conclusion. 103

Chapter 3: Translation of culture-specific aspects of the source text. 105

3.1. Introduction. 105
3.2. Cultural lacunas. 107
3.3. Words denoting measures. 113
3.4. Non-equivalence of semantic fields in the SL and the TL. 119
3.5. Names. 126
3.6. Translating personal pronouns. 132
3.7. Participles and gerunds. 144
3.8. Word order. 147
3.9. Idioms. 149
3.10. Puns. 152
3.11. Translating culture-specific gestures. 156
3.12. Conclusion. 159

Chapter 4: Tolstoy's style in *Anna Karenina.* 161

4.1. Introduction. 161
4.2. Universalising human experience. 167
4.3. Repetition as 'the most characteristic feature of Tolstoy's style'. 170
4.4. Repetition of verbs defining speech. 173
4.5. Repetition of words with the same morphological element. 175
4.6. Compound epithets. 177
4.7. Nouns formed from verbs and adjectives, and words with the prefix *не-* (non-). 178
4.8. Shifting points of view in narration. 179
4.9. Tolstoy's compound comparatives. 182
4.10. Retardation: 'a comic build-up to a rhetorical climax'. 183
4.11. Compound sentences: coexistence of different events in the same period. 185
4.12. Use of rhythm in *Anna Karenina.* 185
4.13. Peasant expressions. 188
4.14. Voices of individual characters. 190
4.15. Use of proverbs in the novel. 191
4.16. Foreign words and turns of speech in the novel. 193
4.17. Inconsistencies of the narration. 195
4.18. Conclusion. 196

Chapter 5: Translating Tolstoy's style and voices of his characters. 199

5.1. Introduction. 199
5.2. Occasionalisms and neologisms. 199
5.3. Metonymical use of names. 201
5.4. 'Iconic richness'. 204
5.5. Lexical repetitions. 207
5.6. Conjunction *и (and)*: its use and repetition. 220
5.7. Repetition of verbs defining speech acts. 223
5.8. Verbs describing action in progress. 226
5.9. Ambiguities through changing points of view. 229
5.10. Metonymic sentences. 232
5.11. Compound sentences: coexistence of different events in the same period. 234
5.12. 'Compression' of the language. 236
5.13. 'Plainness of words' and euphemisms. 237
5.14. Depicting life with 'unparalelled reality'. 243
5.15. Free verse. 245
5.16. Idiosyncrasies of peasant speech. 246
5.17. Voices of characters. 247
5.18. Translating quotations from the Bible. 254
5.19. Translating poetry as intertextuality. 254
5.20. Presenting Tolstoy's views and beliefs in translation. 258
5.21. Conclusion. 262

Chapter 6: Conclusion 264

Notes 270

Bibliography 273

INTRODUCTION

One of the key issues in the recent translation theories has been on whether the translator should remain invisible. The term *invisibility* describes the extent to which certain translation traditions tolerate the presence (i.e. intrusion, intervention) of the translator in the translation (Hatim 2001, 45). This term originated in the works of Lawrence Venuti, himself a literary translator since the late 1970s. Venuti suggests that 'invisibility' reveals itself in two related phenomena:

The 'effect of discourse', that is, the translator's use of language;

A 'practice of reading' or the way translations are received and evaluated (Venuti 1995, 1).

A translation from one literary language into another one normally involves three transfers: from one natural language into another one; from one time into another; from one cultural milieu into another one (Hochel 1991, 41).

Those transfers can result in an *invisible (domesticating)* translation where the target text is perceived as if it was originally written in the target language, within the target culture and for the contemporary audience. They can also result in a *foreignising* translation, which makes it obvious to the reader that the original literary work belonged to a different language, age and culture.

Hatim defines *domestication* as 'an approach to translation which, in order to combat some of the ''alienating'' effects of the foreign text, tends to promote a transparent, fluent style'. '*Foreignisation* is 'a translation strategy which deliberately breaks target linguistic and cultural conventions by retaining some of the "foreignness'' of the source text". (Hatim 2001, 46) The German philosopher and theologian Friedrich

Schleiermacher formulated the distinction between the two strategies most emphatically. In his 1813 lecture on the different methods of translation Schleiermacher argued that "there are only two. Either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him; or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author towards him." (Schleiermacher 1963.) Thus every translator has to choose between a domesticating method and a foreignizing method. The first one is "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values, bringing the author back home", and the second one is "an ethnodeviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad" (Ibid. 20.) Further on in this thesis I will show that most translations actually achieve a certain compromise, domesticating the text in some aspects and foreignizing it in others.

Venuti (1995) shows that Anglo-American literary history has been for a long time dominated by domesticating theories – that recommend fluent translating. As France (2000, 9) points out, domestication 'has long been, and still remains, an essential criterion for judging the success of a translation'. For many British readers the model of good writing was provided by such works as Fowler's *Modern English Usage* or *The King's English*. Those works declared their preference for the familiar over the far-fetched, the concrete over the abstract, the single word over the circumlocution, the short word over the long, Saxon word over the Romance. If one accepted a given stylistic doctrine as possessing general validity, then translations could be all judged by their conformity to conservative literary taste (Ibid. 9).

In this thesis I am going to explore the relationship between foreignization and domestication in translations of *Anna Karenina* into English. Henry Gifford points out that 'Tolstoy's readers in the English language are not greatly outnumbered by those who read him in Russian' (Gifford 1978, 17). There have been at least ten translations of *Anna Karenina* into English, covering over a century of the history of literary translation.

Gifford points out that with so many readers depending on the English translation for their knowledge of a very important writer, the question of how to communicate his effect is quite as central nowadays as that of how to represent Homer was for Matthew Arnold when he wrote his famous essay *On Translating Homer* (Ibid. 17.) It is therefore worth trying to establish certain parallels between successive translations of classic authors and successive translations of Russian classics.

In the next chapter I will explore different theories and practices in the history of translation into English. My research will especially concentrate on the period between 1886 (when the first English translation of *Anna Karenina* appeared) and 2000 (the date when the latest translation was published).

I have chosen five translations of *Anna Karenina* for source text – target text analysis. Four of them (Garnett, Maude, Edmonds and Pevear) have been chosen because they are still in print. Therefore they are still read by modern readers. Dole's translation has been included in my analysis as it is the first translation of the novel and because it appeared during one of the most interesting periods in the history of English translation – namely, Victorian foreignization. Tolstoy's Russian text is quoted from the following edition: Л.Н. Толстой, Собрание сочинений в двадцати томах, Государственное Издательство Художественной Литературы, Москва 1963. It will be referred to as 'Tolstoy', followed by the volume and page number. For the target texts I use the following editions:

Anna Karenina by Count Lyof N. Tolstoy. Translated by Nathan Haskell Dole. London: Walter Scott, Limited (further referred to as Dole);

Anna Karenin by Count Leo Tolstoy/ Translated from the Russian by Constance Garnett/ London: William Heinemann, Ltd. 1923 /(further referred to as Garnett);

Anna Karenina / A Novel by Leo Tolstoy/ Translated by Louise and Aylmer Maude In Two Volumes/ Oxford University Press London: Humphrey Milford, 1937 (referred to as Maude, followed by the volume number);

Leo Tolstoy/ *Anna Karenin/* Translated by Rosemary Edmonds/ Penguin Classics, 1978 (referred to as Edmonds);

Leo Tolstoy/ *Anna Karenina/* Translated by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky/ Penguin Books Ltd, 2001 (referred to as Pevear).

CHAPTER 1: DOMESTICATION AND FOREIGNIZATION IN THE HISTORY OF ENGLISH TRANSLATION

1.1. History of the Theory of Translation. Venuti describes the history of translation theory as a set of changing relationships between the translator's actions and the concepts of equivalence and function. Equivalence is defined as a 'variable notion ' of the connection between the original text and its translation and function is 'a variable notion' of how the translated text is connected to the receiving language and culture. (Venuti 2000b, 5).

A diachronic study of translation history undoubtedly requires a period classification. George Steiner (1975) believes that the whole history of translation theory could be divided into four periods.

In the first period, seminal analyses and pronouncements stem directly from the enterprise of the translator. The period started with Cicero's and Horace's statements on translation and finished with Alexander Fraser Tytler's Essay on the Principles of Translation (1792). All the analyses and beliefs during that period stemmed from the practical work of translating, thus the central characteristic of the period is that of 'immediate empirical focus.' The 18th century finished with a relatively coherent body of theory (the first systematic study of translation processes in English by Tytler), whose rationalistic character and empiricism was its downfall in the Romantic climate (Kelly 1979, 224.) Tytler advocated that translation should have the ease of original composition and respect English literary decorum and therefore praised Pope's expurgation of Homer. By the end of the 18th century the preference in translation theory was clearly given to fluent translation.

According to Steiner, the second period of the history of translation theory began with Schleiermacher's lecture *Uber die verschiedenen Methoden des Ubersetzens* (1813). Schleiermacher advocated the method of 'moving the reader to the author', preserving the peculiarities of the foreign text. Schlegel and Humboldt saw different languages as immeasurable in their individuality and continued Schleiermacher's approach of interlingual transfer as a problem of understanding speech acts and emphasising with the source text. If during the first period translation was seen as a means to appropriate texts, Romantics rather saw it as a way to enrich the readers by enabling them to appreciate the difference of other cultures.

The third period started in 1940s with the publication of first papers on machine translation as well as the application of structural linguistics and statistics to translation. There was little understanding of one group of theorists or translators by another. One can say that different translation theories developed in response to specific situations: for instance, Americans (like Nida) developed translation theory in the context of anthropological research and Christian missionary activity, the English to fit the needs of colonial administration (Kelly 1979, 225). It is therefore hardly a coincidence that towards the end of the period Savory concluded that the experts in translation theory had 'bequeathed to us a welter of confused thought' (Savory 1957, 49.) Unlike during the first two periods, the emphasis was not on translating literary texts but rather on transmitting information from one language into another, so the most important issue was how to make this information clear to the target reader.

The essential feature of Steiner's fourth stage is consolidation of theory, a combined interdisciplinary effort to understand the process of life between languages. The fourth period started in the beginning of the 1960s with the works of Mounin, Nida and Catford. The arguments began between those who believed that anything could be translated into any language and those who insisted that nothing could be translated at all, and Humboldt's ideas about the uniqueness of every language were "rediscovered",

therefore preserving this uniqueness was seen as important once again. It is during this period that "classical philology and comparative literature, lexical statistics and ethnography, the sociology of class-speech, formal rhetoric, poetics, and the study of grammar are combined in an attempt to clarify the act of translation and the process of 'life between languages'" (George Steiner 1975, 238).

As Bassnett points out, it will always be difficult to study translation theory diachronically, since the first period covers the span of about 1700 years whilst the last two periods cover thirty years (Bassnett 1980, 40-41.) Nevertheless, there are certain concepts of translation that have prevailed at different stages of literary history.

1.2. Domestication in Early Translations in England**.** During the Middle Ages English was initially marginalized as a literary medium in comparison with the languages used for learning (Latin) and polite culture (French). Ellis shows that it was Chaucer's decision to write only in English that proved crucial for future developments of English literary culture and translations of the late 14th- early 15th centuries were characterised by an aggressive self-confidence about the adequacy of the English language for the translation of texts from other languages. Before Chaucer hardly anyone in England had defended translation. Chaucer did so in his prologues to Book II of *Troilus and the Astrolabe* ('natheless suffice to the these trewe conclusions in Englissh as wel as sufficith to these noble clerkes Grekes these same conclusions in Grek'). Trevisa provided his *Polychronicon* with two prologues, the first a spirited defence of vernacular translation, the second a description of some of his distinctive practices. (Ellis 2000, 42-43.) The fantasy for some early English translators was that one day the tables would be turned and Latin would be considered just a stiff aid for learning English. (Boutcher 2000, 46.)

During the period starting from Henry VIII's reign great classical books were introduced to the country, which was from the literary point of view still backward but whose language was fresh and vigorous. (Cohen 1962, 9.) During that time translators

worked in cultural conditions diametrically opposed to modern ones. For then virtually nobody outside the British Isles ever dreamt of needing to learn English. Modern translators, on the other hand, are conscious that English has become the world's lingua franca, the vehicle of a great body of classical English and modern Anglophone literature, in the way that Latin was before. They are mainly translating for people, who will never see or read a copy of the 'original' book, who will take translation for the original. (Boutcher 2000, 50.) The arrival of great English literature in the 16th century was made possible due to translated and indigenous works in English which unlearned gentlemen and courtly ladies could consume by the 1690s : Shakespeare, for instance, worked from the sources of comparatively recent Italian writers, such as Giovanni Boccaccio, and in writing his historical plays he drew largely from Sir Thomas North's translation of Plutarch's *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans*. Matthiessen (1931, 3) says that a study of Elizabethan translations is a study of the means by which the Renaissance came to England. Translators were creating the literary English language, accommodating continental literature to particular 'local' circumstances in England. Conscious of their cultural inferiority to the continent, they brought foreign books into the English language 'with all the enthusiasm of a contest'. (Ibid. 3.) They would check several versions of prestigious continental texts in different languages and translate from different sources without privileging the language of 'original' composition. Even the translators of the King James Bible checked their text against the French, Spanish and Italian versions.

Since literate people were normally expected to read French and Latin, anglicisation often meant popularisation, adaptation to a new audience of less sophisticated tastes. In the earlier translations landmarks of aristocratic cultural reference were omitted : references to classical legend, the appreciative detail of physical beauty and moral perfection. The plot was stripped to essentials in the English translation of *Floris and Blanchefleur:* the conflict between Christianity and paganism with the ultimate victory of Christianity was omitted as well as other details, like Floris playing chess, etc.;

in *Sir Perceval de Galles* the story of the Grail was omitted. On the other hand, as a more sophisticated English audience emerged whose social aspirations exceeded their knowledge of French or Latin, translators gradually had to introduce more signs of literary awareness. Sometimes the translator stated that he was telling his tale in English for the benefit of his audience, who may be unfamiliar with French, then he would reassure them that many noblemen are unfamiliar with French and that his story is taken from reputable sources in an old book. (Burnley 1989, 42.)

Sometimes translations were dedicated to particular patrons on particular occasions. They could be pointed towards an urgent issue of the moment in the household of the dedicatee, like – in a royal household – a pressing issue in foreign policy. The 1710 Act for the Encouragement of Learning extended the concept of authorship to encompass translation as an independent creation that did not infringe the copyright of the foreign author who had produced the original work. The ideological motivation behind anglicising foreign literature (i.e. translation as a means of enriching both the language and the literature appropriate to the political needs of the expanding nation) was later formulated by an 18th century English translator in the preface to his version:

> You, my Lord, know how the works of genius lift up a head of a nation above her neighbors, and gives as much honor as success in arms ; among these we must reckon our translations of the classics ; by which when we have naturalized all Greece and Rome, we shall be so much richer than they by so many original productions as we have of our own. (Cit. Chamberlain 1992, 61.)

1.3. Domestication in Early Translation Theories. There was no translation theory in the medieval period. As national states began to mature in the 16th century, the main purpose of translation became enrichment from foreign stores of the developing vernacular and its literature through appropriating ancient literature. The theory of translation, like literary theory in general, derived from classical sources. The views of Cicero and Horace who encouraged translators not to stick too closely to the original and to translate sense for

sense rather than word for word, were to have great influence on Renaissance translators whose aim was to "naturalise" classical literature like the Romans had appropriated Greek texts. The most frequently quoted works on translation became Cicero's *De optimo genere oratorum* and Horace's *Ars Poetica* (T.R. Steiner 1975, 7.)

The founder of the translation theory as a specific was a French humanist Etienne Dolet, who was strangled and burned with his books, for adding the phrase *rien du tout* in Plato's passage about what existed after death, which implied doubts about immortality. In 1540 Dolet had published a short outline of translation principles, entitled *La maniere de bien traduire d'une langue en aultre*, summarised the fundamental principles of translation in five paragraphs:

The translator must fully understand the sense and meaning of the original author, although he is at liberty to clarify obscurities.

The translator should have a perfect knowledge of both source language and target language.

The translator should avoid the tendency to translate word-for-word renderings.

The translator should use forms of speech in common use.

The translator should choose and order words appropriately to produce the correct tone (Cit. Bassnett 1980, p.54).

Dolet's principles are clearly domesticating, already in the first principle he gives translators the liberty to clarify obscurities in the original and make their texts clear for common readers.

The so-called 'golden age of French translation' (T.R. Steiner) began with Malherbe's version of the thirty-third book of Livy (1616). Malherbe's main concern was for the clarity of his text and the pleasure of his reader, so his translation views were primarily audience-oriented. He rejected word-for-word translation and retrenched repetitions to avoid offending any 'esprit delicat'. Conrart, the first secretary of the Academie Francaise, considered translation to be an excellent prose model for French

writers. Nicolas Perrot D'Ablancourt was the leading shaper of the French – and to some extent English – translation theory. His long preface to his translation of Lucian (1654-1655) illustrates his decisive preference for fluency: changes are necessary to make the translation 'agreable' (i.e. pleasant), otherwise it will not be Lucian. D'Ablancourt's choice was not the fidelity to the original author but to 'l'agrement' and to the author 'encore en vie', namely, himself (D'Ablancourt 1972, 185; T.R. Steiner 1975, 14-17). He also expressed the understandable concern a translator would experience when translating an author with an established reputation: if the translator does not correct the author's imperfections, the target reader will blame the translator rather than the author. Thus D'Ablancourt wrote about translating Tacitus: 'Car on n'a le mesme respect pour mon Francois que pour son Latin; Et l'on ne me pardonneroit pas des choses, qu'on admire souvent chez luy' (D'Ablancourt 1972, 120). The French translation theory was therefore domesticating and reader-orientated, and the translators' concern about the reader's spirit or taste suggests that they did not consider their French readers or the French language to be any less sophisticated than the original Roman readers and the original Latin. D'Ablancourt even emphasised that the purpose of his work was not to teach his readers Greek or Latin.

There were, however, foreignizing aspects in D'Ablancourt's translation. He wrote detailed comments on how to translate Roman military titles and names of certain places – he preserved Roman titles because they did not have equivalents in French. He preserved certain Roman names of places where countries had changed so many times that places described by Tacitus did not correspond to any 17th century provinces. (For those places familiar to French readers he would use French names: 'Nos Peres mesmes ont dit Naples et le Tibre, et non pas Napoli ni le Tevere, pour accomoder les choses a leur pronouncation'.) D'Ablancourt explained his reasons for using Roman monetary units. When Arminius promises his soldiers hundred sesterces a day, it would have to be rendered into French as seven livres ten sous, yet no one would offer their soldiers such a

ridiculously uneven sum of money. D'Ablancourt therefore preserved the Roman money and put the corresponding French value on the margin of the page to avoid obscurity. He initially intended to translate following the Roman calendar, nones, ides and calends, 'parce que cela apporte quelque majeste', but then decided against it to avoid making the translation more mysterious than the original was meant to be. (Ibid. 123-124.)

In England the appearance of translation theory in the 17th century seems to have coincided with the decisive emergence of fluency as the most prevalent strategy for rendering foreign poetry and prose. The theory was initially influenced by the classical translation principles (Horace's recommendation to translate sense for sense instead of word for word) and the naturalising strategies of contemporary French translators. Several English translators like John Denham and Abraham Cowley actually lived in France in exile and were certainly familiar with the French tradition. Chapman declared in the preface to his translation of *The Iliad* (1611) that there has to be a spiritual union between the author and the translator, 'an emphatic art in which the translator goes both beyond and before the text.' Chapman reiterated Dolet's principles, stating that a translator should avoid word for word renderings; attempt to reach the 'spirit' of the original; avoid overloose translations, by basing the translation on a sound scholarly investigation of other versions. (Bassnett 1980, 55)

Unlike Dolet and D'Ablancourt, Chapman was more concerned with recreating the poetic 'spirit' of the original than with the readers' pleasure. T.R. Steiner (1975, 24-25) suggests that, although there was a common theory of translation in England and France, a distinction of emphasis (or loyalty) within that theory: the French tradition was pragmatic (audience-centred) whilst the English tradition was poetic (poet-centred). Denham believed that a free poetic translation was the only way of doing justice to the original author, whilst word-for-word translation could only preserve the dead author's ashes:

A new and nobler way thou dost pursue

To make Translations and Translators too.

They but preserve the Ashes, thou the Flame,

True to his sense, but truer to his fame. (Cit. T.R. Steiner 1975, 19)

This is still very similar to d'Ablancourt's attack on 'scrupulous' translators who 'pour un corps vivant ne donnent qu'une carcasse'. As T.R. Steiner (Ibid. 18) points out, d'Ablancourt's apparent vanity and egoism are often a drive towards fidelity on high artistic level, whilst his goal is to maintain the fame of the original author by bringing pleasure to his contemporary audience.

Chapman imagined the ghost of Homer telling him:

(…) thou didst inherit

My true sense, for the time then, in my spirit;

And I, invisibly, went prompting thee

To those fair greens where thou didst English me (Cit. T.R. Steiner 1975, 10)

Chapman's translating career is indicative of how domesticating translation gradually allowed more liberty to the translator. He translated The *Iliad* into 'fourteeners', the long-line ballad metre, unusually long for an English ear, declaring that it was the only possible metre to translate Homer, yet three years later rendered *Odyssey* (1614-15) in 10-syllable couplets – a more domestic meter, and added rhymes to the poem. Translating *Odyssey*, Chapman already felt free to abandon the Greek text completely to demonstrate his respect of Homer's hero as well as his own political preferences: as he traces the journey of Ulysses, he 'enthusiastically blackens his hero's enemies, deliberately reversing the honorific epithets which Homer freely bestows even on the suitors and Polyphemus… More serious is the incursion of the Jacobean revenge ethic' (Rosslyn 2000, 351.) Thus Chapman's translation can be considered an 'adaptation' – an extreme form of domestication.

In 1656 Abraham Cowley wrote about his translation of Pindar's *Odes*:

I have in these two odes of Pindar taken, left out, and added what I please; nor made it so much my aim to let the reader know precisely what he spoke, as what was his way and manner of speaking (T.R. Steiner, 1975, 67).

Here we have a translator who justified his omissions and additions as purely a matter of individual choice. Yet, Venuti notes that Cowley's *Pindarique Odes* came to rank among the most widely circulated of translations. And so Cowley's method inspired a veritable trend for paraphrastic renderings (Venuti 2000a, 56.)

The same year *The Destruction of Troy* was published, a partial version of Virgil's *Aeneid,* by Denham, who used current English with minimal Latinate words and archaisms; Denham also sought to present *Aeneid* as contemporary writing: "If Virgil must need speak English, it were fit he should speak not only as a man of this Nation, but as a man of this age" (T.R. Steiner 1975, 65.) Venuti points out that Denham's domestication was addressed not to the whole English-speaking nation but to the royalist aristocracy. In the *Destruction of Troy* the architectural features of Priam's palace bear a strong resemblance to Whitehall, and the excerpt ends at Priam's decapitation, evoking the execution of Charles I. (Venuti 2000a, 55.)

Twenty-five years later John Dryden published his version of *Ovid's Epistles* (1680) in which he reduced all translation to three categories:

Metaphrase – word by word and line by line translation;

Paraphrase – translation with latitude, where the author is kept in view by the translator, but his words are not followed as strictly as his sense;

Imitation – translation similar to Cowley's, writing an English poem with the original merely serving as a pattern. Imitation is 'the most advantageous way for a translator to shew himself' as he may be able to create a masterpiece more perfect than the original one. Still it is 'the greatest wrong which can be done to the memory and reputation of the

dead' as it will not allow the reader to know the original author's thoughts' (T.R.Steiner 1975, 70.) On the other hand, Dryden also condemned 'metaphrase', a translation which is 'too faithful': ''tis a faith like that which proceeds from superstition, blind and zealous' (Ibid. 69), referring to the religious fanaticism of the Protestant sects during the Civil Wars. At the same time, he admitted that the type of the translation should depend on the original author: Pindar, for example, is too dark and confusing for an English reader, so he can be translated only by imitation. In his own translation practice Dryden followed Chapman's third principle, borrowing freely from previous English translations of Virgil, repeating rhymes, phrases and entire lines. He borrowed from both good and bad translations, improving the bad lines and integrating the good ones seamlessly into his own poetic style. As Sowerby notes, Dryden's translation of the *Aeneid* may be regarded 'as the grand summation of the 17th-century couplet tradition: he took phrases, rhyme-words, and sometimes whole lines from published predecessors' (Sowerby 2000, 509.) Like Denham, Dryden endeavoured 'to make Virgil speak such English as he would himself have spoken, if he had been born in England and in this present age' (T.R. Steiner 1975, 72.)

There was, however, a foreignizing aspect in Dryden's translations: he admitted that 'false critics' could accuse him of 'latinizing' too much, something, he felt, was totally justifiable –

When I find an English word significant and sounding, I neither borrow from the Latin, nor any other language; but, when I want at home, I must seek abroad… I Trade both with the Living and the Dead, for the enrichment of our native language. (Ibid. 74)

Dryden exercised a decisive influence on Alexander Pope, who in his versions of *The Illiad* and *Odissey* significantly revised the Greek text, avoiding what he called 'little or ridiculous' literalisms and omitting physical references that he found offensive to the English sense of moral propriety (Ibid. 57.) Like Dryden's, Pope's translation was built on all the preceding English versions of Homer. Pope's main loyalty was to Literature itself

('Diction and Versification only are proper Province', he argued), and as he was rendering a version in English, he was therefore dedicated to preserving the effect of poetic energy on the reader, so that 'no man who has a true Poetical Spirit is Master of himself' (Cit. Venuti 2000a, 57; Rosslyn 2000, 352.) Indeed, most readers, whether or not they knew classical languages, enjoyed Pope's writing. Samuel Johnson (1779) observed that Pope had translated Homer 'for his own age and his own nation' and therefore he 'knew that it was necessary to colour the images and point the sentiments of his author' (T.R. Steiner 1975, 122.)

In 1791 Alexander Fraser Tytler published the first systematic study of the translation processes in the English language. Tytler set up three basic principles:
The translation should give a complete transcript of the idea of the original work.
The style and manner of writing should be of the same character with that of the original.
The translation should have all the ease of the original composition.

In his principles Tytler replaced the lofty concept of 'spirit' with the more pragmatic concepts of 'idea' and 'style', using the standard 18th century comparison of the translator/painter, introduced by Dryden[i]. Tytler's third principle advocates invisible translation in its very modern definition – a translation should read as if it were the original. As Venuti comments, for Tytler good translation was not only fluent but also respectful of English literary decorum. He urged translators to 'prevent that ease from degenerating' by refusing to render classical literature into 'the style of the Evening Post' or 'the low cant of the streets' (Tytler 1978, 119, 220). He praised Pope's 'expurgation' of Homer, who, Tytler agreed, tended 'to offend, by introducing low images and puerile allusions. Yet how admirably is this defect veiled over, or altogether removed, by his translator Pope' (Venuti 1995, 71.)

The fluency of Pope's Homer set the standard for verse translations of classical poetry, so ancient poets began to emerge "from the mill of decorum in more or less

undifferentiated batches of smooth rhyme, or blank verse, and elegant diction" (Wilson 1982, 80.)

Thus domestication was a commonplace in the 17th-18th centuries' translation theory and practice. At the same time, translators recognised that a ratio of loss and gain inevitably occurs in the translation process and situates the translation in an equivocal relationship to the foreign text. They respected, at least in theory, the original author's individual style. Dryden, for instance, declared that a translator must maintain "the character of an author, which distinguishes him from all others" (T.R. Steiner 1975, 51.) Pope stated that where Homer is plain and humble, 'we ought not to be deterr'd from imitating him by the fear of incurring the Censure of a meer English Critick.' He also disagreed with the use of modern terms in translations of ancient texts. He wrote: 'certainly the use of modern Terms of War and Government, such as *Platoon, Campagne, Junto,* or the like… cannot be allowable; those only excepted, without which it is impossible to treat the Subjects in any living Language.' Most importantly, he realised that no translation, however close to perfection, was to satisfy all the readers, 'since a meer Modern Wit can like nothing that is not Modern, and a Pedant nothing that is not Greek…' (Ibid. 91-95.)

Venuti comments that the domesticating tradition of the 17th-18th centuries rested on a double fidelity, to the source-language text as well as to the target-language culture, and especially to its valorisation of transparent discourse of translation. 'But this was clearly impossible and knowingly duplicitous, accompanied by the rationale that a gain in domestic intelligibility and cultural force outweighed the loss suffered by the foreign text and culture.' Translators saw their domesticating method as the most effective way to produce versions adequate to the classical texts (Venuti 1995, 67-68.)

1.4. Fluency Techniques and Alternative Translation Strategies in the 17th-18th centuries The goal of fluency and easy readability dominated translation during the 17th

and 18th centuries. The main tendency was towards clarity, a clear lexicon and linear syntax, which made translators edit foreign texts, delete and insert passages, add annotations. Philip Francis, whose translations of Horace were considered accurate, ‘ventured to change the Expression, as it could not be understood by an English Reader’, replacing the subtle phrasing of the Latin texts with the plainest English terms” (Venuti 2000a, 61.)

Translators chose traditional English literary forms for their translated texts. The rhymed heroic couplet became the most popular form of translation. Translating unrhymed classical texts into the couplets was later criticised by translators such as William Cowper and Francis Newman (see below). Early translators also emphasised the fidelity to their readers by pompous dedications (‘My most gracious and sacred Maecenas, Henry, Prince of Wales, our Sunn, Heyr, Peace, Life…’ in Chapman’s translation of Homer). They also accentuated their own presence, for example, so that the initial letters of the first lines made the name of the translator.

As a characteristically bourgeois set of values came to dominate English culture, the adherence to decorum occasionally resulted in sheer bowdlerisation. Samuel Dunster, whose prose version of Horace was reprinted several times, prided himself that ‘I have castrated our Poet, in translating nothing that bordered on Obscenity, or that was contrary to the Rules of Decency and good manners’ (Venuti 2000a, 61.) In 1758 James Grainger published his translation of Tibullus’ elegies, explaining: ‘Those who understand the Original, need not be told the Reasons which obliged the translator to alter and omit many passages’… In one of the elegies Tibullus laments that an older and richer man has bribed away the boy he loves. Grainger turned the boy into ‘the lovely Maid’ and masculine pronouns into feminine ones and then found himself in a tangle when dealing with Tibullus’s claim that, to please the boy, he had done his best to help his affair with a girl. As Gilmore comments, this is a very obvious example of domestication: ‘hardly allowing a Roman to make love like a Roman’ (Gilmore 1999, 15.)

Domestication particularly manifested itself in the marked tendency toward topicality as many translators chose foreign texts whose themes were related to the contemporary social situation in England, in prefaces and annotations inviting the reader to create historical allegories. This was, of course, a safer option for translators who wanted to be published and read and whose income largely depended on their translations. Since the choice of published translations is largely defined by the needs of the target market, it is possible to suggest that generally those translators who are not entirely dependent on their translating income, for instance, academics, would be more likely to choose foreign texts outside the main literary canon. The needs of the target market had to change when more people began to read for pleasure and new topics had to be introduced; also when more people began to travel and became interested in contemporary foreign cultures.

Although domestication constituted the main trend in English translation, alternative theories and practices did in fact exist, and their reception ranged from harsh criticism to utter neglect of those translations. William Cowper, for example, attacked Pope's translation of Homer for its inaccuracies, complaining that 'instead of Homer in the graceful habit of his age and nation, we have Homer in a straight waistcoat' (Venuti 2000a, 62.) He argued that faithful translation of classical poetry cannot be rendered in rhyme. In 1791 Cowper prefaced his own translation of Homer with the assurance: 'I have omitted nothing; I have invented nothing' (T.R. Steiner 1975, 135.) However, his own text shows that that was not the case. For instance, Rosslyn notices that in Cowper's *Odyssey* Nausicaa asks her father for a cart, she says: 'Sir! Wilt thou lend me of the royal wains a sumpter-carriage?' Cowper acknowledges in the annotation that she actually calls him 'pappa! a more natural style of address, and more endearing', but he 'feared to hazard' a word so 'familiar'. The address 'sir' makes the translation sound as if it was written for the upper-class 18th century English audience, whereas 'pappa' would have been more foregrounded for the august English literature of the period. So Cowper's translation was

also a domesticating one, although less so than the translations of Chapman, Dryden and Pope. Cowper eventually admitted: 'If we copy (Homer) too closely…instead of translating we murder him' (Rosslyn 2000, 354.)

Another translator who opposed the dominant tendencies of the period was Dr John Nott, a physician, the first Englishman to translate the complete surviving collection of Catullus's poems. Nott's bilingual edition, intended to give 'the whole of Catullus without reserve', consisted of 115 poems. Nott included the Latin text and translated sexual references, minimising the possibility of euphemism and expurgation by rendering the Latin terms quite closely. Nott's rhymes were rather casual and his twelve-syllable line was metrically irregular. His initial reason was to satisfy 'the inquisitive scholar (who) might wish to be acquainted with the ribaldry, and gross lampoon of Roman times.' Although Nott knew that Catullus's sexual references were 'repugnant' to the English morality, he chose not "to conceal, or gloss them over, through a fastidious regard to delicacy". Venuti compares this translation with George Lamb's translation of Catullus (1821) in which Lamb developed strategies of 'omission and amplification', revising on the assumption that Catullus was 'a genius originally pure, however polluted by the immorality of its era' (Venuti 1995, 81-91.) Paraphrasing Dryden, one could say that Lamb endeavoured to make Catullus speak such English, as 'he would have himself spoken, if he had been born in England, and in this present age'. Lamb was praised for his expurgation of Catullus, while Nott's translation seemed so foreign to English tastes that it was repeatedly damned on both moral and stylistic grounds. (Ibid. 91-92.)

At the turn of the 19th century foreignising translation lacked cultural capital in English but was very active in the formation of the German national culture. The 17th and 18th century German translation had been dominated by the Lutheran tradition of fluent translations. Luther had laid such emphasis on producing the accessible vernacular Bible that he equally used the verbs *ubersetzen* 'to translate' and *verdeutschen* 'to Germanize'. (Bassnett 1980, 49) The most important works of 18th century translation theory in

Germany began to emerge in 1770s in the writings of Johann Georg Hamann, Heinrich Wilhelm von Gerstenberg and Johann Gottfried Herder, who wrote of language as inseparable from national character and individual identity, and addressed the difficulties of removing a text from its cultural context. Hamann and Herder wrote of language denying that it was a passive system of signs for communication and proclaiming it to be the means of mediation between God and people. Herder's principal doctrine was that people from different historic periods and cultures vary tremendously in their concepts, beliefs, sensation, etc. He was also the initiator of rapidly spreading Shakespeare cult in Germany. The generation of romantic translators that followed, such as Schleiermacher, Humboldt, Goethe and Schlegel, began to explore modes of translation that would preserve 'the foreignness' of the foreign text (Bernhofsky 1997, 175-176.) In a letter to Schlegel of 1796 Humboldt wrote:

Every translator must inevitably come to one of the following stumbling blocks: he will either hold to the original with too much precision at the expense of the taste and the language of his people or rather to the originality of his people at the expense of the work that is translated… (Cit. Berman 1984, 9)

In his 1813 lecture Schleiermacher made clear that he preferred foreignising translation. He insisted that translations from different languages into German should read and sound different. Thus the reader should be able to guess the Spanish behind a translation from Spanish, and the Greek behind a translation from Greek. If that does not happen, the identity of the source text has been lost. 'Who would not like to permit his mother tongue to stand forth everywhere in the most universally appealing beauty each genre is capable of? Who would not rather sire children who are their parents' pure effigy, and not bastards?' (Cit. Chamberlain 1992, 60) Like English translators and translation theorists, Schleiermacher saw translation as an important catalyst in developing the literary tradition within the target culture: translation could enrich the German language by

developing an elite literature and thus enable German culture to realise its historical destiny of global domination:

> … our nation may be destined, because of its respect for what is foreign and its mediating nature, to carry all the treasures of foreign arts and scholarship, together with its own, in its language, to unite them into a great historical whole, so to speak, which would be preserved in the centre and heart of Europe, so that with the help of our language, whatever beauty the most different times have brought forth can be enjoyed by all people, as purely and perfectly as is possible for a foreigner (Cit. Venuti 1995, 109-110.)

Schleiermacher's target audience was

> the type of reader who is familiar with the foreign language while it yet always remains foreign to him: he no longer has to think every single part in his mother tongue, as schoolboys do, before he can grasp the whole, but he is still conscious of the difference between that language and his mother tongue, even where he enjoys the beauty of the foreign work in total peace (Cit. Venuti 1995, 101.)

In other words, Shleiermacher's foreignising translation was intended for the German educated elite.

Venuti comments that Schleiermacher's theory

> …provides the tools for conceptualizing a revolt against the dominance of transparent discourse in current English-language translation. Yet the effects of this dominance have included … the marginalization of texts in the history of translation that can yield alternative theories and practices – like Schleiermacher's lecture. (Ibid. 117)

The lecture was not even translated into English until 1977.

1.5. Victorian Age and Foreignization The 19th century translation in Britain was typified by two radically different discursive practices. In the domain of theatre translation texts were domesticated and culturally appropriated; plots were subject to substantial alteration to suit the tastes of the English audience, erotic passages were toned down. In the domain of poetry and prose Victorian translators began to explore and develop

foreignizing strategies (Hale 2000, 71.) Bassnett describes five main currents in translation typology in the end of the 19th – beginning of the 20th century:

1) Translation as a scholar's activity, where the pre-eminence of the SL text is assumed *de facto* over any TL version.

2) Translation as a means of encouraging the intelligent reader to return to the SL original.

3) Translation as a means of helping the TL reader become the equal of what Schleiermacher called the better reader of the original, through a deliberately contrived foreignness in the TL text.

4) Translation as a means whereby the individual translator who sees himself like Aladdin in the enchanted vaults offers his own pragmatic choice to the TL reader.

5) Translation as a means through which the translator seeks to upgrade the status of the SL text because it is perceived as being on a lower cultural level

As an example of the fifth type Bassnett describes Edward Fitzgerald, who in 1858 translated *The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam*, declaring that a text must live 'with a transfusion of one's own worst Life if one can't retain the Original's better'. Fitzgerald sought to bring a version of the source text into the target language culture as a living entity. Bassnett contrasts Fitzgerald's view and method with those of Henry Longfellow who saw translation as a means of encouraging the reader to return to the original, whereupon the style in translation was no longer important (the second type). Types 1 and 2, therefore, produce very literal, perhaps pedantic translations, whilst types 4 and 5 could lead to much freer translations that might alter the SL text completely in the individual translator's eclectic process of treating the original. The third category was the most typical of the Victorian age and it tended to produce translations full of archaisms of form and language. (Bassnett 1991, 71.)

The man who introduced the deliberately archaizing type of translation in England was Francis Newman (1805-1897), a classical scholar and brother of the Cardinal. He became the first in a small group of foreignising Victorian translators and probably the

only translation theorist in England to advocate that ‘the translator should retain every peculiarity of the original, so far as he is able, with the greater care the more foreign it may be.’ (Cohen 1962, 24.) Newman produced commentaries on classical texts and dictionaries and vocabularies of oriental languages. A lecturer at Manchester New College and later at University College London, he published Latin versions of *Hiawatha* and *Robinson Crusoe*. Newman encouraged the study of history as it can ‘deepen our knowledge of mankind’.

In the preface to his translation of the *Iliad*, ‘faithfully translated into unrhymed English metre’ (1856), Newman offered a concise account of his translation method. He contrasted it with the ‘principles which I regard to be utterly false and ruinous to translation’, in other words, the principles of the domesticating canon. He wrote: ‘One of these is, that the reader ought, if possible, to forget that it is a translation at all, and be lulled into the illusion that he is reading an original work.’ Newman himself believed that ‘the English translator should desire the reader always to remember that his work is an imitation, and moreover is in a different material; that the original is foreign, and in many respects extremely unlike our native compositions.’

Since Newman developed his foreignising method in the translation of classical texts, for him foreignising came to signify archaistic discourse. He therefore faulted previous English translations because they modernised Greek and Latin texts ‘through an excessive fear that a modern reader will endure nothing else’.

The foreignising technique Newman proposed was an effort to establish a historical analogy between earlier pure and indigenous forms of Greek and English: ‘The entire dialect of Homer being essentially archaic, that of a translation ought to be as much Saxo-Norman as possible, and owe as little as possible to the elements thrown into our language by classical learning.’ That artificially created archaic language must have matched Newman’s view of Homer’s style as ‘direct’, ‘popular’ and ‘forcible’, a product of an oral archaic culture at a rudimentary level of literary development. Homer's style

should be ‘similar to the old English ballad, and is in sharp contrast to the polished style of Pope, Sotheby, and Cowper, the best known English translators of Homer.’

As it is impossible to chronologically equate the old Greek and the old English, Newman made it clear that he was ‘not concerned with the *historical* problem, of writing in a style which actually existed at an earlier period in our language; but with the artistic problem of attaining a plausible aspect of moderate antiquity, while remaining easily intelligible.’ Newman cultivated a kind of artificially constructed archaistic discourse on various levels – ‘in the lexicon, syntax, and prosody of his translations’ (Venuti 1995, 120-123.)

The proportion of archaisms in Newman's version of the *Iliad* was so high that ‘what may have been a recognizable poeticism now risked opacity and reader incomprehension’ (Ibid. 124.) Therefore he appended a two-page glossary to the translation that provided his definitions for the archaic words of diverse origins, such as ‘benight’ (‘promise’), ‘bragly’ (‘braw, proudly fine’), ‘choler’ (‘anger’), ‘skirl’ (‘to cry shrilly’), etc.

As Venuti comments, Newman ‘saw nothing inconsistent in faulting the modernizing tendencies of previous Horace translators while he himself expurgated the Latin text, inscribing it with an English sense of moral propriety’ (Ibid. 123):

I have striven to make this book admissable to the purest-minded English lady, and could never consent to add adornment to a single line of corrupting tendency… Only in a few instances, where the immorality is too ugly to be instructive have I abruptly cut away the difficulty (Newman 1853, vi.)

Remarkably, there seems to be another domesticating aspect in Newman’s translation of *The Iliad* – he translated Greek proper names, calling Xantus *Chestnut*, Balius – *Spotted,* and Podagra – *Spry-foot*, ‘as if a Frenchman were to call Miss Nightingale *Mdlle. Rossignol,* or Mr. Bright *M.Clair’* (Arnold 1905, 83)

Newman's contemporaries clearly disapproved of his translations. Venuti quotes a reviewer from the *National Review* who commented that ‘archaism should not appear plainly to be constrained or assumed, lest a laboured, artificial style of English should suggest the idea of a laboured, artificial style of Greek, than which nothing can be more opposite to Homer’ (Venuti 1995, 124-125.)

In general, Newman’s *Iliad* received little attention in the periodicals until in 1861 Matthew Arnold, then Professor of Poetry at Oxford, attacked it in a series of lectures published as *On Translating Homer*. Although Venuti believes that Arnold condemned Newman’s translation for the lack of fluency because Arnold ‘wanted translation to transcend, rather than signify, linguistic and cultural differences’ (Ibid. 129.), one can argue that Arnold’s views were not entirely domesticating either. He criticised Chapman for ‘the mist of the fancifulness of the Elizabethan age’, Pope for the mist of ‘literary artificial manner’ and Cowper for the ‘elaborate Miltonic manner’ (Arnold 1905, 42.), that is for assimilating to Homer to the English literary values of their ages. He objected to rhymes in a translation of Homer – not because, like Newman said, rhymes ‘positively forbid faithfulness’, but because rhymes change the movement of the original poem. For instance, in Chapman’s version of *Iliad*:

‘We shunned death ever, - nor would I half this vain valor show,
Nor glorify a folly so, to wish thee to advance;
But since we must go, though not here, and that besides the chance…’

‘The moment the word *chance* strikes our ear, we are irresistibly carried back to *advance* and to the whole previous line, which, according to Homer’s own feeling, we ought to have left behind us entirely…’ (Ibid. 45-47).

Arnold praised the ‘general character’ of Newman’s syntax – ‘simple, direct, and natural’, like Homer’s (Ibid. 70.) He felt less comfortable with Newman’s archaisms and his choice to only use words of Saxon origin – as ‘we owe to the Latin element in our language most of that very rapidity and clear decisiveness by which it is

contradistinguished from the German, and in sympathy with the languages of Greece and Rome' (Ibid. 38.) Arnold's main criticism of Newman's translation was the latter's tendency to deliberately use an antiquated language – Homer's verses were some of the first words which young Athenians heard, therefore his language was perfectly plain, intelligible and familiar to them. (Ibid. 143-149.)

Yet Arnold urged the future translators of Homer not to try to create a version that 'shall affect our countrymen as the original may be conceived to have affected its natural hearers' since we do not know how the *Iliad* 'affected its natural hearers'. Therefore, according to Arnold, the only people competent to judge the quality of its translation are Greek scholars with 'adequate poetical taste and feeling' – they alone can say 'whether the translation produces more or less the same effect upon them as the original.' (Ibid. 35-36.) Importantly, Arnold recognised that the manner of translating could be predetermined by the translator's aim:

if his proper aim were to stimulate in any manner possible the general public, he might be right in following Pope's example; if his proper aim were to help schoolboys to construe Homer, he might be right in following Mr Newman's (Ibid. 61.)

However, Arnold was convinced that the translator's 'proper aim' should be 'to reproduce on the intelligent scholar, as nearly as he can, the general effect of Homer.' (Ibid. 61-62.)

It is possible to argue that Newman's and Arnold's beliefs actually represented two levels of foreignization: Newman chose fidelity to the antiquity of the source language whereas Arnold insisted on greater fidelity to the original author, his style and his general effect on those familiar with the source language.

Although Arnold definitely won the debate and Newman's translation was quickly marginalised, other foreignizing translators of the Victorian Age developed strategies close to Newman's[ii]. Robert Browning, for instance, aimed to furnish the reader 'with the very turn of each phrase in as Greek a fashion as English will bear' (Cit. Poole 2000, 358.)

William Morris and Gabriel Dante Rossetti used archaisms to translate medieval poetry. John Ormsby published his translation of *Don Quixote* in 1885, aiming it at the cultivated Victorian reader ‘whose belletristic education allowed them to read archaic and dialectal prose with ease’. Therefore he introduced obscure Elizabethan words and, attempting to reflect the syntax of the original, he often used pseudo-Spanish sentences, hardly related to natural English (Terry 2000, 418.) Expressing his views on archaising Victorian translation, Cohen says that translators like Newman, Morris, Robert Browning, Rossetti, and Edward Fitzgerald were misguided because they had ‘adapted their authors' styles to their more or less erroneous pictures of the age in which these authors lived and worked’ (Cohen 1962, 29.) Cohen believed that the theory of Victorian translation was founded on a fundamental error – conveying the remoteness both in time and place of the original work by the use of “a mock-antique language”. (Ibid. 24.) Yet foreignizing translation did not necessarily have to be archaizing. The Victorians now turned their attention to 18th century classics and 19th century contemporaries. With the growth of pride in national cultures translation was no longer seen as a prime means of enriching a national culture, rather as a means of communications between different nations. When in 1867 Longfellow translated Dante’s *Divina Commedia*, he declared : ‘The only merit my book has it that it is exactly what Dante says, and not what the translator imagines he might have said if he had been an Englishman.’ (Bassnett, 1985, 70.) In 1897 the first prose translation of Catullus appeared in English, in which the translator, Walter Kelly, attempted to adher ‘as closely to the letter of the original as is consistent with the genius of the respective languages.’ Sir Richard Francis Burton claimed that his translation of *The Thousand and One Nights* was ‘plain and literal’, ‘a full, complete, unvarnished, uncastrated copy of the great original’ (cit. Shamma 2005, 54). He tried to achieve the rhetorical and rhythmic effects of the rhymed Arabic prose. And, rather than bowdlerise the original stories, Burton ‘went out of his way to exaggerate their obscenity and made wholly unwarrantable additions to his original’. (Irwin, 2000, 151.)

The “mock-antique language” should not be synonymous with the Victorian translation as it was only applicable to translation of the antique literature, whilst the Victorians now turned their attention to 18th century classics and 19th century contemporaries. By the middle of the 19th century so much of contemporary literature was translated and published in English periodicals that, as Louis James said, ‘French fiction formed the backbone’ of English magazines (Cit. Hale 2000, 68). Translations were often anonymous, with a tendency to literalness, and frequently careless. At the same time, throughout the 19th century French literature was subjected to moral condemnation. In spite of literal translating, offensive passages had to be excised since publishers preferred to avoid legal complications with the authorities as the consequences could be serious. Henry Vizetelly was charged with obscene libel for publishing translations of Zola, fined and later imprisoned for three months. (Hale 2000, 68-71.) The Revd James Long was fined and jailed for offending the colonial British government by publishing an anonymous translation of *Nil-Darpana,* a Bengali play depicting how white indigo planters oppressed Indian peasants. The extent of how strongly one could feel about ideology of a translated work can be seen in the case of Isabel Burton, the wife of Sir Richard Burton. She destroyed his notes for the translation of the Brazilian epic *O Uraguay* because she considered it anti-Jesuitical and offensive to her Catholic beliefs.

Russian society was perceived in England as essentially corrupt and uncivilised. In 1895 Captain R.G. Burton wrote: ‘Russians being an Asiatic nation in many of their characteristics, it is not surprising that the administration of the country is corrupt to the core’ (Burton 1895b, 140). However, only a few months later he praised Russian literature:

It is refreshing, in these degenerate days of modern novel, to turn from the inane indelicacies of fashionable fiction, from the hysterical emanations of the unhealthy imagination of the New Woman and the vapid vapourings of the *fin-de-siecle* young man, to the luminous page of a literature that has in it all the life of true realism, whilst it does

not flaunt in our faces those lower phases of human nature which are best left to the imagination of the prurient.

(…) In the works of all these authors there can be found scarcely a line which could offend the most sensitive reader. (Burton 1895a, 539)

In this context Turgenev and Tolstoy began to seem the answer to English readers' dreams, and Russian novelists were 'rapidly brought inside English culture, imported wholesale if they conformed to Victorian readers' expectations, or made to conform when necessary' (May 1994, 20.)

Cohen believed that Victorian foreignizing standards had begun changing back towards fluency about the year 1871 – that happened with the publication of Benjamin Jowett's *Plato*, translated in a less archaizing manner than many of Jowett's predecessors had done, yet

the Edwardian era suffered from a Victorian hang-over. Even such accomplished work as Constance Garnett's in the field of Russian and William Archer's in his complete Ibsen… constantly reminds the reader or listener that the characters were speaking Russian or Norwegian, and that only thanks to the translator do we know what they said. Their coy pet names, absurd endearments and stiff sentiments underline their essential foreignness… (Cohen 1962, 32-33.)

1.6. Early 20th century – theory and practice in Britain and America: Cohen maintains that 20th century translation was influenced by science teaching, which had placed increased emphasis on the matter rather than the manner, so that translators started neglecting the imitation of form (Cohen 1962, 35.) Pym (2000, 77) adds that "the influence of science was but part of the growing role of educational institutions, and that this, coupled with the requirements of international publishing, privileged exacting plainness over adventurous literariness as a goal in literary translation." Therefore translation in the first half of the 20th century was predominantly domesticating. On the

other hand, translation theory of the beginning of the 20th century was based on the German tradition and Romanticism. As Venuti says, theory and practice then were marked by two competing tendencies:

(…) on the one hand, a formalist interest in technique, usually expressed as innovative translation strategies that match new interpretations of foreign texts; and on the other hand, a strong functionalism, a recurrent yoking of translation projects to cultural and political agendas. (Venuti, 2000a, 12-13.)

The absence of one English-language school of thought in translation studies for the most of the 20th century has been acknowledged by scholars in the last twenty years (see, for instance, Pym 2000; Bassnett and Lefevere 1998). In the first part of the century there were interspersed publications that dominated certain decades: Ezra Pounds's essays in 1917-1918, 1920 and 1929; Hilaire Belloc's lecture in 1931, E.S. Bates' books in 1936 and 1943, R. Knox's publications of 1949 and 1957, T. H. Savory's book of 1957 and the collective volume edited by Reuben Brower in 1959. Ezra Pound's translation theories and practices shared the German interest in literary experimentalism. He was inspired by Dante Gabriel Rossetti's foreignising translations of Guido Cavalcanti, admitting that 'Rosetti is my father and my mother' (Pound, 1954, 20.) In his own translations of Cavalcanti (1912) Pound belonged to the second type of translators, identified by Bassnett (see above), encouraging the reader to return to the original text.

"As to the atrocities of my translation", Pound wrote, "all that can be said in excuse is that they are, I hope, for the most part intentional, and committed with the aim of driving the reader's perception further into the original than it would without them have penetrated." (Cit. Venuti 1995, 192.)

As Venuti notes, Pound's translations signified the foreignness of the foreign text, not because they were faithful to the source texts but because they were deliberately non-fluent, non-English. And that is what John Bailey commented upon in his *Times Literary Supplement* review on Pound:

He is sometimes clumsy, and often obscure, and has no fine tact about language, using such words and phrases as "Ballatet", "ridded", "to whomso runs", and others of dubious or unhappy formation. A more serious fault still is that he frequently absolves himself altogether from the duty of rhyming, and if an English blank sonnet were ever an endurable thing it would not be when it pretends to be an Italian original. (Ibid. 200-201.)

Thus the reviewer criticised Pound's translations more for their lack of fidelity to the source language and style than for their lack of fluency.

Fifteen years later, in *Guido's Relations,* Pound condemned his earlier use of archaisms, explaining that he 'was obfuscated by the Victorian language' (Pound 2000, 27.) Still, he did not abandon his main purpose to lead the reader to the original text, explaining that Rosetti had 'made his own language' (Ibid. 28) and that the translator simply cannot do all the work for the linguistically lazy reader.

He can show where the treasure lies, he can guide the reader in choice of what tongue is to be studied, and he can very materially assist the hurried student who has a smattering of a language and the energy to read the original text alongside the metrical gloze. (Ibid. 33.)

Cohen (1962, 32) says that the 20th century 'did not seriously begin' until after the first World War, and that it started with the publication of Francis Cornford's translation of Plato. Cornford completely dismissed literalism as 'grotesque and silly' and tried to maximise the accessibility of Plato to non-specialists. Certainly fluency in translation was once again the accepted norm in England by the end of 1920s- early 1930s. In his Oxford

lecture Hilaire Belloc maintained that if one wants to translate *The Song of Roland* into English, the object is to produce an English epic (Belloc 1931, 13.) He claimed that 'any hint of foreignness in the translated version is a blemish' because a translation 'should read like a first-class native thing' (Ibid. 22.) Belloc also insisted that a translator should not be restrained by either space or form of the original as the translation will nearly always be of greater length than the original, and, for the true rendering of the spirit, one needs a native form instead of a foreign one. (Ibid. 23-25.)

Similarly, Bates (1936) criticised translators' ambition to be faithful to the original, 'especially with German novels, showing up all their appalling Deutschlandisms, when some extra punctuation and some breaking up of the sentences would be only kind and, in its way, more truthful' (Bates 1936, 104.) Still, Bates' position was more moderate than Belloc's: Bates did not disapprove of the use of archaisms and, in fact, praised John Payne who had produced archaising translations of *The Thousand And One Nights* and of Heine's *Poetical Works*. Bates recommended the use of archaisms with knowledge and tact as 'a single word which obviously belongs to a later date is enough to spoil a paragraph' (Ibid. 119.)

Furthermore, Bates spoke against the expurgation of foreign classics since 'far more reprehensible expansions are in print in… the English language than any that are in danger of being imported' (Ibid. 116), calling, for instance, for the publication of unabridged texts by Emile Zola.

In the 20th century the majority of foreign texts were edited to suit the purposes of a middle class, so they had to be accessible to general readers, unfamiliar with the source culture. Many series were founded in the first half of the century: the World's Classics (1901), Everyman (1906), Loeb (1912) and Penguin Classics (1946). As William Radice says, the Penguin Classics "strove for a typically Penguin combination of popularity and quality" (Radice and Reynolds 1987, 14.) The editors of Penguin Classics, first E.V. Rieu, then Betty Radice, were academically trained but never went into academic life. Gradually

more translators came from academic backgrounds, which brought some rapprochement between theory and practice.

1.7. Alternative points of view. One of the first texts on translation theory in the 20th century Europe was Walter Benjamin's *The Task of the Translator,* published in 1923 as a preface to his German translation of Baudelaire's *Tableaux parisiens.* Benjamin rejected the traditional notion of fidelity, claiming that the translator's primary aim was to extend and deepen his language by means of the foreign language. He quoted a German philosopher Rudolf Pannwitz who declared that 'the basic error of the translator is that he preserves the state in which his own language happens to be instead of allowing his language to be powerfully affected by the foreign tongue' (Pannwitz 1947, 191.) According to Benjamin, a translation should not be a reproduction of the original but its supplement to the target language; and this may be best achieved by a literal (word for word) rendering of the original syntax (Benjamin 2000, 21.)

Like Schleiermacher's lecture, Benjamin's text was not translated into English until 1968.

The dispute between domestication and foreignization in Europe continued. The Argentine writer Jorge Luis Borges in his 1935 essay on the English translators of *The Thousand And One Nights* attempted to show literary translations as different representations of the same text, presupposing a rich literary process. Borges justifies the expurgations of the Arabic texts by different translators on the grounds that the Arabic source text is also a representation, 'an adaptation of ancient stories to the low-brow or ribald tastes of the Cairo middle classes' (Borges 2000, 37.) Evasion of the erotic details does not simply assimilate the text to the English literary and moral values, but also emphasises the Middle Eastern atmosphere of magic, in other words, restores the text to its original values. Borges argues that it is translators' 'happy and creative infidelity' that should matter to us more than anything else (Ibid. 45.)

The Spanish philosopher Jose Ortega Y Gasset discussed the issues of foreignization and domestication in his 1937 essay. He saw the misery of translation in the irreducible differences between different languages and world visions. The splendour of translation is the ability to 'force the reader from his linguistic habits and oblige him to move with those of the author' (Ortega Y Gasset 2000, 60). This is acceptable even though the reader of such a translation must be aware that he will not be reading a literarily beautiful book but using 'an annoying apparatus'. Ortega believed that foreignizing translation would allow modern readers to transmigrate within ancient authors, not perceiving them as models but admiring their difference (Ibid. 62.) Although Ortega's book was not translated into English, it was included in B.Q. Morgan's Critical Bibliography of Works on Translation with a brief summary: 'Only when we oblige the reader to move within the linguistic habits of the author will there be worthy translations' (Morgan 1959, 284.)

Vladimir Nabokov's lecture "The Art of Translation" was published in 1941. Nabokov identifies three grades of evil in the world of translation: 1) obvious errors due to ignorance or misguided knowledge; 2) intentionally skipping words or passages that may seem obscure or obscene to target audience; 3) vilely beautifying a masterpiece "as to conform to the notions and prejudices of a given public" (Nabokov 1981, 315.) The first type of blunders Nabokov sees as 'mere human frailty and thus excusable'. Blunders of the second type could be identified as expurgating domestication, present in so many Victorian translations, and, indeed, Nabokov quotes Nathan Haskell Dole's translation of *Anna Karenina* as 'the most charming example of Victorian modesty'. When Vronsky asks Anna what is the matter with her, she replies: 'Ya beremenna', and unless the reader immediately starts searching in the glossary, similar to the one Newman had made for his Homeric translation, he will keep wondering 'what strange and awful Oriental disease that was' (Ibid. 316.) Nabokov sees the third and the worst 'grade of evil' in 'trying to improve' the source text with professional elegance, and the examples he gives witness

neglecting particular details in the original text that could make the text seem improbable to an attentive reader. In a Russian translation of *Hamlet* Ophelia's 'crowflowers, nettles, daisies and long purples' become 'violets, carnations, roses, lilies' – and it is difficult to imagine 'how anyone could make such a botanical collection between the Helje or the Avon'. 'Beautifying a masterpiece' can also ruin the style of the original author, like Gogol's irrationality completely disappears in the 'prim, perky, and very matter-of-fact' English version of *The Mantle* by Claude Field. (Ibid. 317-318.)

In his lecture Nabokov also identified three types of translators: an exact and pedantic scholar, a well-meaning hack and a talented writer. Neither the scholar nor the professional translator has imagination and style to mimic the original author. The talented writer can attempt to recreate the genius of the original, but 'the greater his individual talent, the more apt he will be to drown the foreign masterpiece under the sparkling ripples of his own personal style' – arguably a more subtle and unintentional form of domestication. Nabokov saw the task of a good literary translator in closely 'impersonating' the author's speech, style and mind (Ibid. 319.)

Nabokov's translation strategy was to preserve as much as possible of the original author's style, and he 'abjured all his style in his own English in order to refer the reader back to Pushkin's Russian' (Boyd 1993, 354). And not just to the Russian. Nabokov believed that Pushkin 'was as much a product of French literature as of Russian culture; and what happened to be added to this mixture, was individual genius which is neither Russian nor French, but universal and divine' (Nabokov 2000, 75.). Nabokov attempted to recreate Pushkin's gallicisms in their Russian metamorphosis. By doing so he challenged the principles of domesticating translation. Nabokov's view was that the translator had to 'reproduce with absolute exactitude the whole text, and nothing but the text'. In the 17th century Denham had condemned literal translation of poetry as 'poesie is of so subtile a spirit, that in pouring out of one language into another, it will all evaporate…' (T.R. Steiner 1975, 23) Nabokov admits that 'shorn of its primary verbal existence, the original

text will not be able to soar and to sing; but it can be very nicely dissected and mounted, and scientifically studied in all its organic details' (Nabokov 2000, 77). He deliberately distorts the English syntax of his translation – 'to remind us that this English has no independent life of its own, and has value only when placed alongside Pushkin's Russian (Boyd 1993, 336.)

Nabokov's *Eugene Onegin* caused such an explosion in the literary world that the translation had to wait for seven years before it was published. It found supporters among those who wanted to get to know Pushkin's original closer than other English versions permitted. Soon after its publication Anthony Burgess noticed: '…if we want to read Pushkin we must learn some Russian and thank God for Nabokov' (Burgess 1965, 74.) Burgess not only appreciated Nabokov's scholarship and how his word-to-word translation would help English readers to get to know Pushkin, but also noticed how this foreignizing translation enriched the English language: '… sometimes the word-for-word technique evokes a new poetic *frisson,* as though Russian were fertilising English[iii]' (Ibid. 76.) Burgess' opinion of Nabokov's translation was the highest praise any translator could hope for: 'I know of no other work which, ostensibly serving no higher purpose than to ease the way into an unknown piece of great art, itself approaches great art' (Ibid. 78.)

Only a month before Burgess' review on Nabokov's *Eugene Onegin* appeared, the same journal (*Encounter*) published an article by Robert Graves, called 'Moral Principles in Translation'. Unlike Nabokov, Graves claimed that 'the more faithful a rendering, the less justice it does' to the original (Graves 1965, 53.) He saw that the translator's duty is 'to treat the other man's work with as much respect as if it were his own, and present it with loving care – which means, in practice, correcting small faults and clarifying references' (Ibid. 55.)

1.8. Theory and Practice in the 1960s. The long existing debate between foreignization and domestication made T.H. Savory state in 1957 that

> (…) there are no universally accepted principles of translation, because the only people qualified to formulate them have never agreed among themselves, but have so often and for so long contradicted each other that they have bequeathed to us a welter of confused thought. (Savory 1957, 49)

To demonstrate his statement, Savory made a list of pair-wise contradictory translation principles:

A translation must give the words of the original.

A translation must give the ideas of the original.

A translation should read like an original work.

A translation should read like a translation.

A translation should reflect the style of the original.

A translation should possess the style of the translator.

A translation should read as a contemporary of the original.

A translation should read as a contemporary of the translator.

A translation may add to or omit from the original.

A translation may never add to or omit from the original.

A translation of verse should be in prose

A translation of verse should be in verse.

Savory suggested that the choice of a translation strategy could depend on the target audience. He identified four different groups: the reader who knows nothing at all of the original language; the student who is learning the language of the original; the reader who knew the language in the past but has now forgotten most of it; the scholar who knows the language.

> The reader who does not know the language is happy with the free translation; the student is best helped by the most literal translation; the third prefers the translation that sounds like a translation – it brings back more keenly the memories of his early scholarship and gives him a subconscious impression that almost he is reading the original language. The scholar might enjoy the feel of scholarship, even though his comments are more likely to be caustic or critical. (Savory 1957, 58-59)

By the 1960s scholars saw translation as a distinctive linguistic activity of communicating the foreign text by establishing a relationship of identity with it.

Eugene Nida saw two basic conflicts in translation theory: literal vs. free translating and emphasis on form vs. emphasis on content (Nida 1964, 22.) Nida's development of a translation science was motivated by a personal dislike for what he saw as a classical revival in the nineteenth century, an emphasis on technical accuracy, an adherence to form, and a literal rendering of meaning. The principal exponent in English of this movement, according to Nida, was Matthew Arnold, whose approach was clearly too scholarly and pedantic for Nida's taste, placing too many demands upon the reader to become informed about the original culture (Gentzler 1993, 44-45.) What Nida really disliked about Arnold was the latter's idea to translate not for people in general, but for a select audience who knew the originals (Nida 1964, 20). At the same time Nida recognised that 'despite Arnold's objection to some of freer translations done by others, he was at least strongly opposed to the literalist views of such persons as F. W. Newman'. Nida also agreed with the belief Arnold had that translation had to affect the target reader the way the original must have affected its first hearers (Ibid. 164.)

Nida founded his translation theory around two different types of equivalence: formal and dynamic. The formal-equivalence translation focuses on the message in both form and content. In this type of translation the translator attempts to reproduce literally and meaningfully both the form and content of the original. The formal-equivalence translation is designed to permit the reader to identify himself with the author in the source-language context, and to understand as much as he can of the customs, manner of thought, and means of expression. For example, a phrase like 'to greet one another with a

holy kiss' would be rendered literally and probably supplemented with a footnote explaining that this was a customary method of greeting in New Testament times (Ibid. 159).

In contrast, the dynamic equivalence is based upon 'the principle of equivalent effect'. The translator then is not so concerned with matching the receptor-language message with the source-language message, but with the dynamic relationship. That means that the relationship between receptor and message should be similar to the relationship between the original receptors and the message, like R. Knox insisted that a translation should be 'read with the same interest and enjoyment which a reading of the original would have afforded' (Ibid. 164.) To demonstrate what dynamic equivalence means, Nida quotes J.B. Phillips's rendering of the New Testament as one of the modern English translations which, perhaps more than any other, seeks for equivalent effect: Phillips translated 'greet one another with a holy kiss' as 'give one another a hearty handshake all around' (Ibid. 160.)

Nida attempted to define a good translation by contrasting it with bad translations of two kinds:

Bad	Good	Bad
Formal correspondence: the form (syntax and classes of words) is preserved; the meaning is lost or distorted	Dynamic equivalence: the form is restructured (different syntax and lexicon); to preserve the same meaning	Paraphrase by addition, deletion, or skewing of the message

This scheme basically repeats Dryden's classification of the three types of translation: with paraphrase considered to be a good translation and metaphrase and imitation seen as the two extremes that should be avoided. According to Nida, the ultimate

test of a translation must be based upon three major factors: 1) the correctness with which the receptors understand the message of the original (that is to say, its 'faithfulness to the original' as determined by the extent to which people really comprehend the meaning),

2) The ease of comprehension and

3) The involvement a person experiences as the result of the adequacy of the form of the translation. As the main purpose of Nida's project was translating the Bible and converting people to Christianity, he believed that the best praise a translator could hope for would be to have a reader say: 'I never knew before that God spoke my language' (Nida and Taber 1969, 173.) Nida must have felt he was expressing the common view among translators, but his argument did not necessarily persuade those concerned with literary translation.

Nida's strategy is best suited for the first type of readers as identified by Savory (see above). Literary translators have to consider other types of readers, who may be more interested in getting to know the original author's style. This choice becomes even more complex when it comes to translating poetry.

As Weissbort (2000, 96) says, the choice between foreignization and domestication affects translators of poetry more than those of prose, if only because poetry is now read by a small minority, so that the commercial risks of publishing foreign-looking versions is also less significant. The most remarkable project of foreignizing translation in the second half of the 20th century was the publication of Catullus's poetry, translated by Celia and Louis Zukofsky (1969). The Zukofskys offered a brief description of their method in the preface to their homophonic translation: 'This translation of Catullus follows the sound, rhythm, and syntax of his Latin' – rather than the sense and style. The foreignizing process began in their title, where they kept a Latin version: *Gai Valeri Catulli Veronensis Liber*. Louis Zukofsky attempted to write English-language poems that mimicked the sound of the Latin while also attempting to preserve sense and word order. That resulted in 'a dazzling range of Englishes, dialects and discourses that issued from the foreign roots of

English (Greek, Latin, Anglo-Saxon and French) and from different moments in the history of English-language culture' (Venuti 1995, 214-217.) Venuti considers those shifts from contemporary slang to pseudo-archaic constructions in Zukofskys' translation as foreignizing because, in their deviation from transparency, they force the English-language reader to confront a Catullus that consists of the most extreme linguistic and cultural differences (Ibid. 219.)

The Zukofskys' translation was criticised by most reviewers. Nicholas Moore (*Poetry Review,* 1971), for instance, complained that it doesn't relate to the present in any real way' and recommended a total Anglicisation of the Latin text by using the most current English (words like 'sexy') and discarding a Latin name for a British-sounding one ('Coldham'). (Ibid. 222-223.)

<u>1.9. The cultural turn in translation studies.</u> In the 1970s the study of translation occupied a minor corner of applied linguistics, an even more minor corner of literary studies, and no position at all in cultural studies. (Bassnett 1998, 124.) Debate on translation was dominated by evaluative critical language, as shown above judging translated texts for their fluency and accessibility. Foreignizing translations were often condemned as 'translationese' (writing suspended somewhere between the source and target languages), and critics would see it as a failure to realise the conditions of normal transfer between languages.

As 'the first clear signal of a change in the wind' Bassnett sees the Leuven seminar in 1976 where Andre Lefevere was given the task of drawing up a definition of translation studies. Lefevere's goal was to 'produce a comprehensive theory which can be used as a guideline for the production of translations', so that translations made according to that guideline 'might influence the development of the receiving culture'. Therefore theory and practice were to supply 'mutual nourishment'. (Ibid. 124-125.)

One can hardly find a better example or theory and practice supplying mutual nourishment than the publication of Gayatri Spivak's foreignizing translation of Derrida's *De la grammatologie* the same year. As Gaddis Rose (2000, 298) says, Derrida had a new sound which Spivak echoes. Readers sensed that this foreignized translation was closer to the original. Foreignization did not immediately become the norm in fiction translations, but was becoming increasingly more acceptable for Derrida and other French postmodernists.

The translation of Schleiermacher's lecture into English in 1977 once again caused more discussion concerning the two translating strategies : do readers really want translations that sound if they were written in English ? In 1978 Roothaer wrote that if a reader turns away from a translation that is too foreign, then 'in many cases the reader is more to blame than the translator'. After all, a reader who undertakes to read a work of the past in his own language needs to realise that 'he must acquaint himself as far as possible with the culture or background of that past period, and the same holds for translations'. (Cit. Leighton 1991, 92.)

The 1980s started with the publication of Bassnett's *Translation Studies* (1980), a book that maintained the relative autonomy of the translation from its original. Defining equivalence came to be seen as a less urgent problem. Scholars, such as William Frawley, began to challenge the notion of equivalence as an 'identity' between foreign text and translation. Frawley questioned whether this identity was construed as empirical (absolute synonymy based on reference), biological (the same organs of perception and cognition), or linguistic (universals of language). He stated that if translating is a form of communication, 'there is information only in *difference'* (Frawley 2000, 257.) Frawley also commented on the fact that 'fidelity' to the original produced the least interesting translations (Ibid. 260.) He concluded the essay, declaring that the translation theory must abandon notions of good, bad and fidelity, replacing them with the terms of moderate or radical translation. By a radical translation Frawley means a translation that is neither

close nor free, and this kind of translation is normally seen as 'bad' since it 'evidently disregards fidelity for the sake of saying something new'. In actuality, he says, the radical translation carries the most semiotic information and probably more intrinsic interest. (Ibid. 261-262.)

Philip Lewis (1985) analysed English translations of Derrida's inventive French texts and proposed a new axiomatics of fidelity, distinguishing between translating that "domesticates or familiarizes a message" and translating that 'tampers with usage, seeks to match the polyvalencies or plurivocities or expressive stresses of the original'. The latter kind of fidelity Lewis advocates he calls 'abusive': it both resists the constraints of the target language and interrogates the structures of the source text. This fidelity is not only to the semantic substance but also to the modalities of expression and to rhetorical strategies (Lewis 1985, 41.)

Antoine Berman in *L'epreuve de l'etranger* (1984) depicted the German Romantic tradition of translation, calling for many retranslations that could enrich the French target language and potentially even 'bend' its literary creativity. In his 1985 essay he questioned the 'ethnocentric' translation that 'deforms' the foreign text by assimilating it to the target language and culture. Berman notices that masterpieces of prose are normally characterised by a kind of 'bad writing', a certain 'lack of control' – this can be seen in Rabelais, Cervantes, Montaigne, Saint-Simon, Sterne, Jean Paul Richter, Balzac, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky (Berman 2000, 287.) He names twelve deforming tendencies that inevitably bear on all translations:

1) Rationalisation. Rationalisation recomposes sentences and the sequence of sentences, rearranging them according to a certain idea of discursive order. Berman cites Marc Chapiro, the French translator of *The Brothers Karamazov*: 'the original heaviness of Dostoevsky's style poses an almost insoluble problem to the translator. It was impossible to reproduce the bushy undergrowth of his sentences, despite the richness of their content.' This kind of rationalisation deforms the original.

2) Clarification. Clarification aims to render 'clear' what is not meant to be clear in the original. The same translator of Dostoevsky wrote: 'To render the suggestions of a Russian sentence, it is often necessary to complete it.' Clarification can signify two different things: a) the manifestation of something that is not apparent, but concealed or repressed in the original, and this kind of manifestation Berman calls 'the supreme power of translation". Clarification in the negative sense (b) aims to render 'clear' what was not meant to be clear in the original.

3) Expansion means that translations are longer than originals – something that Hilaire Belloc had already commented upon in 1931. But Berman notes that expansion is a stretch that impairs the rhythmic flow of the text.

4) Ennoblement consists of producing more 'elegant' sentences than in the source text, while utilising the source text as raw material – similar to Dryden's concept of 'imitation'. The logical opposite of ennoblement is a blind recourse to a pseudo-slang, which popularises the original.

5) Qualitative impoverishment means replacing the words in the original with words that lack their sonorous or onomatopoetic richness.

6) Quantitative impoverishment implies replacing signifiers with other words. Berman gives the example of a Spanish ST that uses three different synonyms for face; rendering them all as *face* would involve loss.

7) The destruction of rhythms: although more commonly used in poetry, rhythm is still important to the novel and can be destroyed by deformation of word order and punctuation. Berman brings out an example when a sentence by Faulkner had four marks of punctuation in the original – yet acquired twenty-two in the translation, affecting the original rhythmic structure.

8) The destruction of underlying networks of signification. The literary translation contains an 'underlying' text – the subtext. Translators sometimes use words that authors avoided on purpose.

9) The destruction of linguistic patternings: Berman says that the discourse of the translation is asystematic, although its asystematic nature is concealed by the linguistic patternings in the original.

10) The destruction of vernacular networks or their exotisation: vernacular networks are essential because all great prose is rooted in the vernacular language. It may be a question of effacing diminutives in Spanish, Portuguese, German or Russian, or it may involve replacing verbs by nominal constructions. The traditional method of preserving vernaculars is to 'exoticize'" them, either by taking them into italics or by emphasising the vernacular according to a certain stereotype of it.

11) The destruction of expressions and idioms: Berman considers the replacing of an idiom or proverb by its TL equivalent to be an 'ethnocentrism'. Replacing idioms by their equivalents will result in the absurdity, for example, where American characters express themselves with a network of French images.

12) The effacement of the superimposition of languages: the superimposition of languages in a novel involves the relation between dialect and a common language or the coexistence of several languages in a text. Berman names Thomas Mann's novel *The Magic Mountain* and its French translations as fascinating examples of heteroglossia or diversity of languages. In the German original the characters Hans Castorp and Madame Chauchat communicate in French, and the German man's French is different from the young Russian woman's. In the translation by Maurice Betz the two varieties of French are framed by the translator's French.

Maurice Betz let Thomas Mann's German resonate in his translation that the three kinds of French can be distinguished, and each possesses its specific foreignness. This is the sort of success – not quite impossible, certainly difficult – to which every translator of a novel ought to aspire (Ibid. 296.)

This success is, of course, related to the effect Nabokov attempted to create in his translation of *Eugene Onegin*, preserving both Russian and French formulas in Pushkin's Russian vocabulary.

All the twelve deforming tendencies, as traditional and historical as they are, result in 'a text that is more "clear", more "elegant", more "fluent", more "pure" than the original.' They result in what Berman calls 'the destruction of the letter in favor of meaning' (Ibid. 297).

One of Berman's deforming tendencies, namely the destruction of expressions and idioms, can be particularly destructive when English is a target language. Leighton (1991, 136) notices that because of the variety of 'Englishes', a translation characterised by obvious English words and expressions would sound artificial to an American, and a strongly Americanised version will be irritating to British readers. In either case the reader will begin to question the language of the original text, especially the language of its characters.

In the last ten years some scholars began to question whether the choice between domestication and foreignization needs to be binary, as Schleiermacher had put it: 'The two roads are so completely separate from each other that one or the other must be followed as closely as possible.' Pym (1995, 5) wonders whether Schleiermacher's two opposed methods suppress 'a hidden middle term, the living translator'. In her study of French translations of *Hamlet,* Romy Heylen analyses the ways in which the play was acculturated to meet the needs of the target audiences. Rather than choose between foreignization and domestication, she proposes a historical-relative, socio-cultural model of three kinds of translation:

1) Translations that do not really attempt to acculturate the original work; the translator adheres to the cultural codes that inform the source culture: the translated original is perceived as "exotic" and "bizarre" and will most likely stay on the periphery of the receiving culture;

2) Translations that negotiate and introduce a cultural compromise; these translations confront the problem of communication by selecting and balancing characteristics common to both source and receiving culture: the translator has altered the codes of the receiving culture in such a way that those confronted with the alteration will at the same time recognise the alteration and the code; the translated original may attain a canonised position;
3) Translations that completely acculturate the original work; the translator adheres to the codes which inform the receiving culture. Translations that completely acculturate the original work could be expected to “modernise” and “naturalise” linguistic context, linguistic intertext and socio-cultural situation.” (Heylen 1993, 23-24.)

Bassnett and Lefevere (1998) offer a classification that describes three essentially different translation models:

The Jerome Model: This model is based on the concept of equivalence, and its main principle is to translate the text as faithfully as possible. The model is characterised by the presence of a central, sacred text (the Bible). The original ideal of fidelity was the interlinear translation, in which one word would match another. For the sake of this fidelity the Jerome model had to reduce thinking about translation to the linguistic level only. Bassnett and Lefevere maintain that the days of the Jerome model are numbered, at least in the West, because the type of faithfulness commonly associated with equivalence is no longer imposed on translators. Nowadays translators are free to choose a kind of faithfulness that will ensure, in their opinion, that a given text is well received by the target audience.

The Horace Model: This model historically predates the Jerome Model, but has been overshadowed by it for fourteen centuries. The Horace model implies being faithful not to the text but to the customers who were Horace’s customers only in his time, i.e. being faithful to the target audience. In the Horatian model there is no sacred text, but there is a privileged language, Latin in Horace’s time or English today. Translating into English, we are almost ‘slanted’ towards English, so that almost everything foreign and exotic becomes standardised.

The Schleiermacher Model: This model of translation emphasises the importance of ‘foreignising’ translation. The privileged position of the target language is denied, and the

differences of the source text need to be preserved. If all translations read and sound alike, the identity of the source text has been lost in the target text. Each of the three models has a place in a developing study of translation, as long as they are not seen as mutually exclusive (Bassnett and Lefevere, 1998, 2-8.)

Within this classification it is possible to suggest that the first two models produce domesticating translations, so to some extent both of them are in opposition to Schleiermacher's model.

Whether or not the choice between domestication and foreignization is a binary one, all modern scholars recognise that a literary translator needs to balance between the source and the target cultures. Toury refers to the translator's choice as 'the initial norm' between adequacy, i.e. adhering to the source text norms, and acceptability, i.e. subscribing to norms originating in the target culture (Toury 1995, 56.) Crisafulli adds that the choice between adequacy and acceptability is only a matter of general orientation, a tendency whereby the translator approximates predominantly either source or target norms (Crisafulli 2001, 4.) This general orientation, of course, becomes more specific when one takes into account the style of an individual author in its relation primarily to the source but also to the target cultures. As Gifford says, the translator of Tolstoy will have to mediate between 'continuous literary decorum' and the literal text a good dictionary can supply (Gifford 1978, 20.)

By the end of the 20th century 'it had become normal to advocate ''taking the reader to the author''… But that is no doubt not the end of the story' (France 2000, 5.) Many canonical authors have now been or are going to be retranslated. In 1991 Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation of *The Brothers Karamazov* was judged to set a new standard in the translation of canonical works, although since then they have been criticised for unnecessary awkwardness of the language. McDuff's retranslation of Andrey Bely's *Petersburg* (1995) can be said to be too foreignizing: whilst the previous translators, Maguire and Malmstad, have found a skilful solution to Bely's word-play on

grafinia/grafin ‘countess’/’decanter’, replacing it with ‘countess’/’counter’, McDuff has left the Russian, as he did with words like *droshky* and *raznochinets.* (Falchikov 2000, 606-607.)

The critique of domestication acquired a more political dimension in the 1990s with the publication of Cheyfitz’s book *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from 'The Tempest’ to Tarzan* (1991). Cheyfitz equals translation with colonisation: ‘the translation of the “other” into the terms of empire’ (Cheyfitz 1991, 112.) With the world trying to recognise the limitations of the Eurocentric point of view, readers have turned to Latin American, African and Indian novelists, looking for more difference in translation.

Venuti notes that the theory and practice of English-language translation have been dominated by fluent domestication. He believes that in contemporary Anglo-American culture translators are judged successful when their work is most fluent and they are mostly “invisible” to the readers. They are underpaid because copyright fails to give their authorship full recognition. Behind the translator’s invisibility is a trade imbalance that limits the number of foreign texts translated into English and submits them to domesticating revision. All of this leads to complacency in Anglo-American relations with other cultures, which is imperialistic abroad and xenophobic at home. Venuti sees that translation should be an instrument of power in the construction of national identities for foreign cultures and suggests that ‘foreignizing translation in English can be a form of resistance against ethnocentrism and racism, cultural narcissism and imperialism, in the interests of democratic geopolitical relations’. (Venuti 1995, 19-20.) His preferences for foreignizing translations in Schleiermacher’s sense have evolved into a recommendation that the translator’s language should be non-fluent and heterogeneous independently of any fidelity to the source language. Venuti believes that, to signal the foreignness of the foreign text, the translator must vary the translating language and culture and introduce deviations from those strategies that are most frequently used to translate foreign texts.

Through such deviations the reader can come to realise that they are reading a translation. (Venuti 2002, 10.)

<u>1.10. Criticism of Venuti's Theory of Domestication and Foreignization.</u> Venuti's critics can be divided into two groups: translation theorists, who mainly disagree with his belief that foreignizing translation can be used as a form of resistance against the imperial colonisation, and those who question his definitions of domestication and foreignization.

Venuti's preference of foreignizing translations has been criticised by scholars such as Pym and Robinson. Pym argues that, although foreignizing translation can promote cultural change, this cultural change does not outweigh Schleiermacher's Prussian nationalism and German universalism. Pym objects to Venuti's belief that 'foreignizing translation in English can be a form of resistance against ethnocentrism and racism, cultural narcissism and imperialism, in the interests of democratic geopolitical relations'. Pym questions this statement: if Schleiermacher's recommended method of foreignizing translation was designed to strengthen German as a target language that could then become a major source language, why would the same method make English target language weaker or at least 'closer to some unspoken ideal of fair international exchange'? (Pym 1995, 26)

I think the answer to Pym's question is in the fact that German in Schleiermacher's did not have the cultural status that English enjoys today. Foreignizing translation can influence different languages in different ways: minority languages become more 'cultivated' and therefore more likely to become major source languages, whilst more prestigious languages become more 'cosmopolitan' and more tolerant of the 'otherness'.

Pym also criticises Venuti's ideas about the translator's invisible position within Anglo-American culture. Schleiermacher's rejection of commerce is entirely compatible with the 'Romantic conception of authorship' that Venuti dismisses as the cause of the translator's marginalization. Furthermore, writes Pym, Venuti makes no attempt to counter

the quantitative argument that the more difficult a translation is to read, the less impact it will have on the target culture. Finally, Schleiermacher's 'translation proper' is distinguished from all commerce and therefore it should give Venuti no right to complain about translators being underpaid. (Ibid. 26-27.)

Pym's later review article on Venuti is even more detailed. There he occasionally catches Venuti on his use of words, like: 'translation is repeatedly described in terms of violence (lots of it), which doesn't leave me many words for the kind of violence where people bleed and die as a result of transcultural relations' (Pym 1996, 166.)

I would tend to agree with Pym that the word *violence* could be too strong when applied to translation, but so is then the word *cannibalism,* for example (see Gentzler 1993, 192-193). Other of Pym's examples of Venuti's obscurities can be perhaps too "picky". He questions Venuti's labelling of Robert Graves' term *homosexual relationship* as 'an anachronism' (Pym 1996, 167.) Yet if one reads Venuti, he correctly describes Graves' use of *homosexual relationship* to render *prostratae regi pudicitiae* in the life of Julius Caesar. Venuti calls Graves' expression 'an anachronism, a late nineteenth-century scientific term that diagnoses same-sex sexual activity as pathological and therefore inappropriate for an ancient culture in which sexual acts were not categorized according to the participants' sex' (Venuti 1995, 33). Likewise, Pym talks about Venuti's 'strange praise for Berman's insight when translating Schleiermacher's *Geist* as *esprit* (p.110) (what else might he have used?)'. Fair enough, but Venuti praises Berman's translation of *die gesammte Geistentwikkelung* as *le processus global de la formation de l'esprit* only in comparison with Lefevere's domesticating translation into English. Lefevere missed the word *Geist,* translating the phrase as *the whole evolution of a culture*, and Venuti simply means that Berman's use of the word *esprit* is closer to Schleiermacher's original meaning.

In the review article Pym also challenges Venuti's representation of fluent translation as 'radically English', i.e. characteristic of Anglo-American culture. He quotes

a paper by a Brazilian researcher Maria Helena Luchesi de Mello, who shows that the Brazilian press praises fluency just as much as the American and British press. Yet the translation situation in Brazil is different from the one in Britain or in the United Press – in 1993 eight of the ten most sold works of fiction were by non-Brazilians, translations make about 50% of all publications as opposed to 2-4% in Britain and America. Brazilian culture is heterogeneous at home and scarcely imperialist abroad. Therefore, Pym argues, the translator's invisibility within a culture is not necessarily connected with the low percentage of translations, and fluent translation is characteristic of other cultures, too, not just of Anglo-American culture (Pym 1996, 170-171.)

I generally agree with Pym's point here, since fluent translation seems to be the prevalent norm in all the languages I am familiar with. But Pym reproaches Venuti for writing a 'highly selective' history of translation in which all the theorists supporting invisibility are English or American, and all the theorists who are arguing for resistance are non-English (Ibid. 171.) It is a fact though that more theorists of translation in Germany have advocated foreignization than in England (Schleiermacher, Humboldt, Benjamin, to name just a few famous German foreignists.) When claiming that resistance is specific to the German cultural tradition, Venuti may be more familiar with the German theory than with German translations. However, Pym himself tells us that fluent translation was forbidden in Hitler's Germany in order to develop Nazi cultural refinement: 'One should not forget that Hitler prohibited 'domesticating' translation' (Pym 1995, 26). It has never been forbidden in Britain or in the United States. Having checked one of the two sources Pym quotes, I would say the word *forbidden* is a bit too strong here, too. There was no law against domesticating translation. It looks like the Nazis encouraged translation into German from weaker source languages – presumably for the reasons of political alliance. As Sturge says, the biggest source language group was the one least promoted by the authorities, most decried by the journals, and most heavily featured in the indexes of banned or restricted works : English. (Sturge 2003, 161.)

Pym himself attempts to explain the tendency towards fluency in translations into English through Toury's law that tolerance of interference tends to increase when translation is carried out from a highly prestigious language/culture, especially if the target language/culture is 'minor' or 'weak'. Therefore one should not be surprised that a culture as prestigious and big as the Anglo-American tends towards fluency in its translations (Pym 1996, 171.) And yet how does one explain the fact that a rather big and prestigious French culture has created such advocates of foreignizing translation as Meschonnic, Blanchot and Berman? Perhaps, the explanation is in the pragmatism of Anglo-American culture, the tendency to put the clarity of meaning before the form of the language? After all, the most influential translation theorist writing in English in the 20th century was Nida, whose approach to translation was primarily pragmatic: to allow target readers to see the relevance of the original message.

In fact, I do not agree with Venuti's treatment of Nida. Venuti writes that Nida is 'imposing the English-language valorization of transparent discourse on every foreign culture' (Venuti 1995, 21.) If we accept that fluent/transparent discourse is not a uniquely English method, then surely Nida's approach of adopting the Biblical message to every minor foreign language and culture must have contributed to the more equal cultural exchange. Would it be better if Nida advocated foreignizing translation and all the minor languages he translated into had to match the major source language (English? Hebrew?), but in that case foreignization would hardly improve the current state of world affairs and help to fight ethnocentrism and racism.

Domesticating translation is generally a more widely accepted norm than foreignizing translation[iv]. Venuti writes that fluency emerges in English-language translation in the 17th century (Ibid. 43), but research into earlier history shows that translation into English before the 17th century was predominantly domesticating, too. So does domestication historically precede foreignization? I think, it is more complicated than that. I would suggest that the earliest translations into a vernacular language would be

word-for-word; and then, as the national literature develops, so does the language, and new translators become aware of that and try to make their translations more fluent to match the language of the national literature.[v] As the translators' cultural awareness increases, they begin to seek to reflect some aspects of the foreign text, i.e. foreignize their translations. I find it surprising that Venuti does not notice the growing trend for foreignization in the 1990s – after all, Pevear and Volokhonsky's foreignizing translation of *The Brothers Karamazov* received the PEN-prize as early as in 1991. Had he mentioned them, Pym would have at least one example of an "unbanished" foreignizing translator (see Pym 1996, 167.)

Another critic of Venuti's ideas of how foreignization can improve the world situation is Robinson. Analysing postcolonial theories, he disagrees with Venuti's claim that foreignizing and domesticating translations are all that different in their impact on a target culture, since every interpretation varies from translator to translator. Sometimes though, he maintains, the quaintness of foreignized texts could make their authors, and the source culture in general, seem childish, backward, primitive, precisely the reaction foreignization is supposed to counteract.

Robinson also denies the existence of clear distinctions between foreignizing and domesticating, since these concepts are based on the naïve picture of the world. 'Fluent' language can be 'foreignized' by the simple act of reading it in a different tone of voice whilst a totally foreign expression can sound familiar if read by a good actor.

Ultimately he claims that the foreignist theories of translation are inherently elitist in their deep mistrust of the popular and support of unusual effects 'that only few of us are able to recognize and appreciate' (Robinson 1997, 109-113.)

Bennett, in his review of Venuti's *The Scandals of Translation,* refuses to see how foreignizing translation can contribute to combating ethnocentric racism or to democratising geopolitical relations. Bennett notices that a reader of a deliberately foreignizing translation, such as Venuti's translation of Tarchetti, is likely to be aware that

they are reading a translation, although they may well regard it as just a piece of clumsy writing. Even if it brings home to the reader more clearly the various aspects of the author's world-view, it is hard to see how this in itself challenges the reader's cultural assumption.

Finally, Bennett suggests that if the predominance of English is due to, in Venuti's words, 'the economic and political ascendancy of the United States', then the way to fight against this domination is in the economic and political sphere. In the case of translation, this would mean not introducing a few archaisms into a translation, or aiming to disrupt target-language cultural values, but choosing texts with a more explicit and revolutionary political and social message (Bennett 1999, 131-133.) This point of view is further developed by Tarek Shamma who seeks to prove that Burton's translation of *The Thousand and One Nights*, foreignizing and very successful, did not challenge English people's preconceptions of the Arabic culture but rather reinforced them (Shamma 2005, 65).

Before I move on to the next part of the discussion, I should try and formulate my own opinion on whether foreignizing translations can really contribute to the improvement of the geopolitical situation. I do agree with Robinson in that the foreignist theory is elitist and foreignizing translations are likely to have different impact on different types of readers, depending on the reader's individual readiness to embrace the unknown. For instance, one can speculate that if all translations were to become decisively foreignizing, then a large group of readers would probably give up reading foreign literature altogether, and that would hardly improve the translator's situation nor would it encourage cultural transfer. Yet the readers who are ready to embrace the unknown, are more likely to experience what the original author wanted his readers to experience, if they are reading a translation that attempts to reproduce the effect certain aspects of the original author's style have on the original readers.

But is that what Venuti means by a foreignizing translation? I am now going to look at how translation theorists have criticised Venuti's definitions of the concepts of foreignisation and domestication.

Tymoczko criticises Venuti's dichotomy by pointing out that a translation may be radically oriented to the source text in some respects, but depart radically from the source text in other respects. Therefore, she insists, there is no single polarity that describes the orientation of a translation (Tymoczko 1999, 55-56.) Tymoczko also claims that Venuti does not carefully define any of the terms he uses, and the distinction between domestication and foreignization is based on earlier conceptualisations of domestication that have been formulated outside translation theory and used broadly in literary criticism. She criticises Venuti for offering no coherent category of what exactly foreignizing translation is. He describes it as a translation which involves 'discursive strategies' that depend heavily on translating into a form of the target language that departs radically from standard norms, a form of the target language that is deformed to reflect the source language. However, elsewhere Venuti indicates that resistant (i.e. foreignizing) translation may be found in texts whose 'discursive strategies' are fluent – because resistance can lie in the choice of the text itself. Furthermore, it is unclear how resistant a translation needs to be so that one can define it as foreignizing. (Tymoczko 2000, 34-37.)

Tymoczko also disagrees with Venuti's claims that fluency is the dominant standard for translations in the United States at present, since Venuti's experience is based primarily on the translation of the 19th and the 20th century literary works between European languages. However, in translation of languages which are not globalized and the translation of old languages fluency is not the norm, since philological standards have remained dominant in most language transfer involving minority languages and the languages of non-westernised cultures. Like fluent translations, philological translations (scholarly word-for-word textual transpositions) also colonise texts by taking literary texts

and turning them into non-literary texts. Therefore any translation procedure can become a tool of cultural colonisation, even foreignizing translation (Ibid. 35.)

Corbett argues that Venuti's theory ignores a tradition of translation into Scots, where 'deviation' from so-called 'standard' English 'is a nativising rather than foreignising strategy' (Corbett 1999, 12.) He also argues against Venuti's preference of foreignizing translations, claiming that a translation that does not respect the 'otherness' of the original can still result in a powerful work of art (Corbett 2001, 166.) Using different translations of *The Seafarer* into English and into Scots, Corbett tries to prove that no clear-cut correlation can be drawn between the visibility of the translator and the variety of language used (Ibid. 170.)

To show the limitations of Venuti's theory, Corbett uses an extract from Celia and Louis Zukofsky's translation of Catullus into English – Venuti's most extreme example of a foreignizing strategy:

'Gellius est tenuis: quid ni? cui tam bona mater
tamque valens uiuat tamque venusta soror…'

(Catullus, cit. Venuti 1995, 222)

'Gellius is thin why yes: kiddin? quite a bonny mater
tom queued veil lanced *viva,* tom queued Venus his sister…'

(Zukofsky, cit. Venuti 1995, 223)

Corbett points out that although Venuti labels the word *bonny* as an archaism, it could be equally well labelled a 'scotticism' (Corbett 1999, 11.)

I do not see how this contradicts Venuti's definitions of domestication and foreignization. Analysing the above translation, Venuti classifies *bonny* as an archaism, *queued* as a Britishism, *viva* as a Latin word, and all of them are seen as deviations from the standard American English (Zukofsky's translation was published in the United

States.) Venuti is even more explicit about it in his later work, claiming that 'foreignizing translation indicates the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text, but it can do so only by disrupting the cultural codes that prevail in the domestic language'. (Venuti 2002, 10.) He classifies Patrick Creagh's translation of a novel by Antonio Tabucchi as foreignizing (presumably from the point of view of an American reader), since the Italian expression "in ferie" becomes "on holiday," whereas the American English rendering is "on vacation." The phrase *non voleva più*' ('he didn't want [it] any longer') becomes 'he didn't fancy it at all', in which the use of the word 'fancy' as a verb is typically British. (Ibid. 11.) Then the norm against which foreignizing translators can kick is the standard variety of the target language – be it British, American or Scots. In other words, within Venuti's theory, a scotticism is as much a deviation from the American target language as an archaism but a different sort of deviation.

However, this approach makes me wonder whether using British words can, in Schleiermacher's terminology, take an American reader to the Italian author. Such a foreignizing translation, consisting of different varieties of the English language, will not allow the reader to guess the Italian behind the Italian translation or to distinguish it from the Spanish behind a Spanish translation, etc. – in other words, it will take the author away from the reader without bringing the reader to the author or deform the target language without matching the source language. I would prefer different varieties of English to be used primarily to match different varieties of the source language, that is to recreate Berman's superimposition of languages.

Here Venuti's description of foreignization turns it into a subjective concept, dependent on the reader's rather than the translator's viewpoint : thus Creagh's translation will be more foreignizing for American readers than for the British ones.

It seems that, following Venuti, one can talk about two different types of foreignizing discursive strategies: the deformation of the target language in order to match the source language, and the deformation of the target language without matching the

source language, simply to indicate the general 'foreignness' of the source text. In my research I see foreignization more as the first type, as an attempt to recreate certain aspects of the source text (adequacy in Toury's terms). Masters of the English language, such as Nabokov or Louis Zukofsky, have produced awkward and obscure English translations for the sake of achieving the precision of Pushkin's meaning or the richness of Catullus's assonances correspondingly, not just to signal the foreigness of Russian or Latin. Rather than describe translations as domesticating and foreignizing, I will try to distinguish between domesticating and foreignizing strategies, present in different translations.

Tymoczko questions Venuti whether resistance/foreignization is related to the specific historic and cultural moment of a translation. (Tymoczko 2000, 37.) I would suggest that the time factor can impact foreignization in more than one way : on one hand, the greater the time distance between the source and the target texts, the more different they could be; on the other hand, if foreignizing strategy means matching certain aspects of the source text, then precisely which aspects of the source text does a translator try to match?

Venuti does not describe domesticating/foreignizing strategies in as much detail as Berman who lists the twelve tendencies that result in the 'destruction of the letter in favour of meaning'. Berman's descriptions are more useful for comparing domesticating/foreignizing strategies. Still, I believe, Venuti's contribution is vital since he offers 'a series of genealogies that write the history of the present' (Venuti 1995, 40.), putting the issue of domestication vs. foreignization in the diachronic perspective.

1.11. Conclusion. Nabokov suggests that the whole history of literary fiction as an evolutionary process is a gradual probing of deeper and deeper layers of life (Nabokov 1981, 164-165). The same can be said about the history of literary translation: it evolves as an exploration of deeper and deeper layers of the source text. The source text is an ultimate result of a complex interaction between the source language, the way the original

author chooses to manipulate the source language and individual voices of his characters. Newman, translating Homer, was more concerned with ‘attaining a plausible aspect of moderate antiquity’ (Cit. Venuti 1995, 123) than with recreating Homer’s poetics. When Venuti says that his translations of De Angelis’s poems ‘aim to be faithful to the linguistic and cultural differences of the Italian texts, their characteristic discontinuity, the neologisms, syntactical shifts, staccato rhythms’ (Ibid. 301), he primarily means reflecting De Angelis’s experiments with the Italian language. Foreignization as an exploration of how to preserve the foreign in the text of a novel has evolved from Newman’s fidelity to the ‘foreignness’ of the source language, towards Nabokov’s fidelity to the original author’s style, and towards fidelity to the voices of individual characters (heteroglossia), described by Berman. These different levels of foreignization require different depth of research into the source text – from the very basic understanding of the language differences to the research into the origins of the author’s vocabulary and to the thorough knowledge of various dialects, male/ female manners of speech, etc. In my research I would like to trace how the history of translation of an individual novel into the English language reflects these stages of evolution. For example, archaising as a foreignizing strategy can be used on different levels. Newman archaised in order to present ‘the entire dialect of Homer’ as essentially archaic. Nabokov (and I am not sure why Venuti does not include him in his list of foreignizing translators) used an archaic *mollitude* to render the Russian *nega*, noting that Pushkin was ‘trying to render the French poetical formulas *paresse voluptueuse, mollesse, molles delices, etc.’* (Boyd 1993, 333.) The greatest variety of foreignizing translations probably belong to the second stage, since different translators seek to preserve (or reflect) different features of the author’s style. The Zukofskys tried to preserve the richness of Catullus’s assonances and for that sacrificed some of the meaning of his poetry; Nabokov sacrificed good fluent English to reproduce Pushkin’s exact meaning and occasionally sacrificed the exact meaning to reproduce Pushkin’s iamb (see Boyd 1993, 330-332).

Since Venuti does not distinguish between the different levels of foreignization, he sees a sympathetic identification between the translator and the author as characteristic of fluent translations. Such a sympathetic identification, however, can equally be present within a non-fluent translation. Nabokov's definition 'he must possess the gift of mimicry and be able to act… 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 1981, 319) is not that different from Tytler's point of view. Tytler wrote: 'he must adopt the very soul of his author, which must speak through his own organs' (Cit. Venuti 1995, 246.) The requirement 'impersonating his tricks' reveals the foreignizing translator's fidelity to the original author – matching the original author's manipulation of the source language in the target language. As I said earlier, I think, Venuti is wrong when he sees Arnold's translation theory as domesticating, since Arnold was clearly concerned about fidelity to Homer's intention – otherwise why did he disapprove of rhymed translations of Homer for their changing the movement of the original poem? In fact, the more the translator is aware of the peculiarities of the author's style and its effect on the reader, the more he is likely to strive to reproduce those peculiarities and that effect in the target text.

I agree with Munday who says that Venuti does not offer a specific methodology to apply to the analysis of a translation. His case studies encompass a range of approaches, but he writes significantly more on critical reception of translations than on the analysis of different aspects of source text – target text pairs. Venuti's general premises about foreignizing and domesticating translation strategies can be investigated in a variety of ways:

1) Comparing the source text with the target text linguistically for signs of foreignizing and domesticating strategies.

2) Interviewing translators about their strategies and/or researching what the translators say they are doing, researching their correspondence with the authors and the different drafts of one translation if available;

3) Interviewing publishers, editors and agents to see what their aims are in publishing translations and what instructions they give to translators;
4) Looking at how many books are translated and sold, and how trends vary over time.
5) Looking at translation contracts to see how 'visible' the translator is in his work;
6) Seeing how 'visible' the fact of translation is, looking at the packaging of the text, the appearance of the translator's name, the copyright assignation, translators' prefaces;
7) Analysing the reviews of a translation, author or period. The aim would be to see what mentions are made of the translators and by what criteria reviewers and the literary elite judge translations at a given time and in a given culture. (Munday 2001, 155-156.)

Methods (1) and (2) are most useful for identifying different translators' strategies, whereas methods (3), (5) and (6) are primarily concerned with the translator's situation within a given culture. Methods (4) and (7) deal with the reception of an author within a culture, but method (7) also deals with the reception of different translations of the same author at different times.

I shall therefore concentrate on researching the history of translating *Anna Karenina* into English, researching how its translators came to translating the novel, what exactly they said about their work and how their translations were received in the English speaking world. This will constitute Chapter 2 of the thesis.

In Chapter 3 I will compare five target texts with the source text in order to see whether the translators have domesticated the cultural differences of the Russian milieu and its language.

In Chapter 4 I shall try to define Tolstoy's style in *Anna Karenina* in Russian and its impact on Russian readers. That will be the basis for analysing in Chapter 5 whether and how translators have matched them in their translations.

CHAPTER 2: HISTORY OF TRANSLATION OF *ANNA KARENINA* INTO ENGLISH

The List of Existing Translations

Carmichael, Joel: Anna Karenina by Leo Tolstoy: the Modern American Translation, New York: Doubleday Dell, 1960.

Dole, Nathan Haskell, Anna Karenina, New York: Crowell, 1886.

Edmonds, Rosemary, Anna Karenin, Hammondsworth and New York: Penguin, 1954; revised edition, 1978.

Garnett, Constance. Anna Karenin, London: Heinemann, 1901; edited, with an introduction, by Leonard J. Kent and Nina Berberova, New York: Random House, 1965.

Gibian, George. Anna Karenina, The Maude Translation, revised by George Gibian, New York: Norton and Company, 1970, 1995.

Magarshak, David. Anna Karenina with a foreword, New York: New American Library, 1961.

Maude, Louise and Aylmer, Anna Karenina, 2 volumes, London: Oxford University Press, 1918; often reprinted, including with an introduction by W.G. Jones, 1995.

Pevear, Richard, and Volokhonsky, Larissa/ /Anna Karenina. London: Penguin Books: 2001.

Townsend, Rochelle S., Anna Karenina, London: Dent, and New York: Dutton: 1912.

Wettlin, Margaret, Anna Karenina, Moscow: Progress, 1978.

Wiener, Leo. Anna Karenin, volumes 9-11 of the Complete Works of Count Tolstoy, Boston: Estes, and London: Dent, 1904.

2.1. Introduction In this chapter I am going to discuss different translations of *Anna Karenina* from the following points of view: what did the translators themselves say about their strategies and how their translations were received by the critics of their time.

Tolstoy began to work on *Anna Karenina* in March 1873. In April 1877 he wrote: 'I have finished everything, everything, I only have to make the corrections' (Turner 1993, 5-11.) As early as in 1879 two articles, mentioning *Anna Karenina* and based chiefly on the Russian text, appeared in the magazines of America and England. S.E. Schevitch in *North American Review* (March 1879, 332-333) explained that Tolstoy's ideal for the submergence of the individual into family life was extensively illustrated in *Anna Karenina* in the manner of life adopted by the Levins. Schevitch believed *Anna Karenina* to be a masterpiece without an equal, perhaps, in any literature.

W.R.S. Ralston's *Count Leo Tolstoy's Novels* appeared in *The Nineteenth Century* the following month. Ralston wrote that Tolstoy's more recent and 'more ambitious' novels were not available for English readers yet, as they had not been translated into any of the Western European tongues. Moreover, because of their great length, Ralston thought it improbable that *War and Peace* or *Anna Karenina* would ever be translated into English.

Tolstoy himself was partly responsible for the English tardiness in accepting his works. In 1878 Ralston wanted to acquaint English readers with *War and Peace* and asked Tolstoy to provide some explanatory notes and biographical data. Tolstoy replied:

> I am very sorry not to be able to give you a satisfactory answer to your letter. The reason of it is that I very much doubt my being an author of such importance as to interest by the incidents of my life not only the Russian, but also the European public…" (Cit. Alexeyev, 1964, 90-91)

The author's own opinion that his longer novels would probably be never translated into the English language offered no encouragement to publishers to commission their

translations. However, although almost unknown in 1885, Tolstoy's volumes were everywhere in England and America by 1887 (Ibid. 26-30.) as the 'awakening of the Anglo-Saxon people to Russian literature' (Davie, 1990, 276) took place. De Vogue's *Le Roman Russe* was published in America in 1886 and in England in 1887. Also, in 1887 Oxford University admitted the 'Lithu-Slavonic' languages to its curriculum. That encouraged publication of Russian dictionaries, textbooks, and it became possible to learn Russian directly, rather than French or German sources.

Tolstoy was the greatest phenomenon of this rapidly increasing interest in Russia: in 1889 he was represented by 40 items in *The English Catalogue of Books* – 18 American, another 12 American translations republished in England and 10 English translations. (Orel 1977, 4)

2.2. Nathan Dole**.** Nathan Haskell Dole (1852-1935) was an American author and translator. Born in Chelsea, Massachusetts, Dole graduated from Harvard University in 1874. After teaching in New York and in New England he worked as a newspaperman in Boston, San Francisco and Philadelphia. Dole translated works by a variety of authors, such as Tolstoy, Daudet, Omar Khayyam, and wrote *The Life of Count Tolstoi* (1911). Dole's translation of *Anna Karenina* appeared in America in April 1886. The same month it was reviewed enthusiastically in *The Critic* (10.4.1886). The anonymous reviewer wrote that when one got to the end of the book one could know Russian official, aristocratic, social and peasant life in the 19th century as well as it is possible to know them from one book. Slightly less enthusiastic was a review in *The Literary World* (17.04.1886), where the reviewer called the book 'inoffensive' in its dealings with the relation of the sexes, even though it spoke 'with a plainness of meaning, sometimes with a plainness of words, which is at least new'. The story, added the reviewer, 'oscillates, swings, sways from side to side like an express train at 40 miles an hour over the twistings and climbings of the Baltimore and Ohio Railway' (*The Literary World,* 17.04.1886, 127.)

In the preface to his translation Dole claimed to have worked directly from Russian with an anonymous French version[vi] at hand for reference 'in a few passages' … 'to hasten the preparation'. Yet, in a review in *The Nation* (6.05.1886) the anonymous critic declared that the real procedure must have been the other way round, i.e. that Dole must have been translating from French (*The Nation* 6.05, 1886, 389). The critic saw Dole's translation as a disappointment, partly because of the inclusion of too many Russian words which 'baffle and disconcert the reader', but mainly because of the 'omission of many details connected with Levin's life and experiments on his estate'. The French version Dole used had been significantly cut, particularly the Levin – Kitty thread, in order to shorten the book. The critic comments that though Dole 'occasionally restores a paragraph to make the sense clearer', he in general follows the French translation so closely that 'he even writes 'non' where the Russian ''no'' is used'.

The critic comments on Tolstoy's repetitions, his awkwardness of style and his manner of occasionally contradicting his own statements. He sees 'the removal of those ''blemishes'' by a translator' as an improvement, although 'it interferes with the proper psychological study of the author, whose personality is as interesting as any of his characters'. (Ibid. 389)

Although the anonymous critic was able to pinpoint the most striking characteristics of Tolstoy's style, his ability to read Tolstoy in the original occasionally let him down. To demonstrate Tolstoy's manner of contradicting his own statements, the critic wrote:

> Thus Varenka in 'Anna Karenina' is made to wear a yellow dress and a white one in the same breath (both are omitted in the translation), and Vronsky's wealth in Italy is not accounted for after the description of his embarrassed circumstances in St Petersburg. (Ibid. 389)

The critic is right as far the second point is concerned. The colour of Varenka's dress, however, is not Tolstoy's mistake but the critic's. She was wearing a yellow dress and a white kerchief which the critic mistakenly took for a dress, confusing 'в белом платке' (wearing a white kerchief) with *'в белом платье'* (wearing a white dress).

William Morton Payne voiced a much more serious objection to Dole's translation in *Dial* on July 13, 1886. The critic called attention to Dole's avowed altering of certain scenes where the realism of the original was 'too intense for our Puritan tastes'. Payne wrote:

> We regret that it should have been necessary to make this avowal. If we are to have translations of the masterpieces of literature at all, we have a right to demand that they shall be as accurate as scholarship can make them. The alteration of a single word or any conscious modification of its meaning is a serious offence to literature. If 'Puritan taste' cannot take great writers as they are, so much the worse for that particular species of taste. Literary and artistic tastes have quite as good claims to be considered. (Cit. Smith, 1939, 86)

In 1886 Henry Vizetelly issued Dole's translation of *Anna Karenina* in England – without disclosing the translator's identity. The translation was approved in *Athenaeum* together with a translation of Dostoevsky's *Injury and Insult (Униженные и оскорбленные)*:

> As a general rule English versions of Russian books are based upon French or German translations. But *Anna Karenina* and *Injury and Insult* have been translated directly from the Russian, and the translations have been in both cases executed with conscientious accuracy and they deserve a full success. The translator of *Anna Karenina* is, we believe, an American lady. (*Athenaeum*, N3096, 26.02.1887, 281.)

However, Matthew Arnold in his essay *Count Lev Tolstoi* (*Fortnightly Review*, 1 July, 1887, 785) declared that the English translation of *Anna Karenina* was inferior to the French one. Arnold suggested that 'work of this kind is better done in France than in England, and Anna Karenine is perhaps also a novel which goes better into French than into English'. (Arnold 1887, 785) Arnold therefore recommended reading the novel in French but also suggested that 'if fresh literary productions maintain this vogue and enhance it, we shall all be learning Russian'. (Ibid. 783)

Dole objected to the opinion that French translations of Tolstoy's novels were better than the English ones. In a letter to *The Nation* (16.05, 1889; 406) he wrote:

> The French translations that I have examined are illustrative of one great theory of ''the art'', namely that a translation should reproduce not the style but the general content of the original, as opposed to the counter theory that the form and style should be reproduced as faithfully as possible. In translating Count Tolstoi's works, for instance, the latter theory leads necessarily to a certain boldness. (…) But in the case of an author like Count Tolstoi it seems to me due his greatness to reproduce him in all his rugged strength, even with his invented words and his favourite polyglot.

Three weeks later a reader of *The Nation* objected to Dole's criticism of French translations on the basis that his own translation of *Anna Karenina* did not reproduce the original as faithfully as possible:

> His translation of Anna Karenina is almost totally spoiled by the omission of the greater portion of chapter xi, book II. This chapter is the ethical key to the whole book. One gets an entirely different idea of the characters of Vronsky and Anna from that given in Mr. Dole's translation, when one reads in the French this marvellous presentation of the truth that the punishment of sin commences with the very act, and that to noble natures like Anna there is no delicious period of sinning before the inevitable remorse. Mr. Dole has not only cut out this perfect scene, but he has also, by introducing words of his own, endeavored to hide his fault, and make it appear that no omission was made. I supposed that he imagined he had saved his conscience by saying in the preface that he had omitted some scenes ''in deference to our Puritan taste.'' People prefer the French translations because they expect to find there the whole work of the writer, not garbled to suit any ''taste'' whatsoever. Dole's omissions are only too numerous, and render his work valueless to anyone who wishes to know the great Russian writer as he really is. (*The Nation,* 06.06.1889, 468)

In England Dole's translation of *Anna Karenina* was considered acceptable even after the publication of Constance Garnett's translation. In 1911 a reviewer wrote in *The Fortnightly Review*: 'After most careful study and re-study, I have found that Mr Dole's translation makes a more strong appeal and creates a deeper impression than that by any other hand.' (Low 1911, 728) It is doubtful though that the reviewer was sufficiently qualified to judge the quality of the translation since she spoke no Russian and did not even understand that *Karenina* was the feminine form of a surname. Thus, she wrote about Anna and her husband: 'What ill-fate brought this girl with her loving nature into closest union with the cold, reserved, self-righteous Karenina?' (Ibid. 735)

2.3. Constance Garnett: No other name is as much associated with translations of Russian literature into English during the period of the 'Russian craze'. A reviewer in the *Times Literary Supplement* (4 July 1912, 269) wrote:

> There are few people to whom English readers have better cause to be grateful than Mrs. Garnett for her long line of translations from the Russian. We owe it mainly, indeed we owe it entirely, to her that Russian novels may now be read in sound and native English… Mrs. Garnett has given us Tolstoi and Turgenev…

For the majority of English readers in the first half of the 20th century Garnett meant Russian literature in English (Crankshaw 1947, 95).

Constance Clara Black was born in 1861 in Brighton. Between 1879 and 1883 she studied Classics in Cambridge University. In 1891 she married Edward Garnett, a young writer. In 1891 the Garnetts met a Russian exile Felix Volkhovsky who suggested that Constance should learn Russian. Constance Garnett found the complexity of the Russian

language so exciting that whilst learning it she already started translating *A Common Story* by Goncharov. As early as in January 1892 she wrote to her father-in-law:

I do a few pages – some four or five – of a Russian novel every day, but want a dictionary still for every sentence; and I think it will be some years before I have, as you say, 'mastered' the language, even in the sense of reading it as fluently as French." (Cit. Richard Garnett 1991, 76)

In 1893 William Heinemann accepted Garnett's translation of *A Common Story* and also commissioned her to translate Tolstoy's *The Kingdom of God is within you.* In 1894 Garnett travelled to Moscow where she met Tolstoy and his wife at their home in Khamovniki. Tolstoy was anxious to see her translation of *The Kingdom of God is within you* and said he liked the English translations of his works better than the French ones. (Ibid. 122) Later Tolstoy was very pleased with her translation of *The Kingdom of God.*[vii]

It is now accepted that Garnett's knowledge of Russian was not perfect (Gifford 1978, 21), and that can explain occasional blunders in her translations and her difficulties in translating conversations. Before she went to Moscow she had already translated three Russian novels, yet even after a month in Russia she confessed: 'It is disappointing that I still cannot follow a conversation in Russian'. (Cit. Richard Garnett 1991, 130) As a classicist she had been trained to read Latin and Greek without speaking those languages, and her Russian was probably equally stilted. Even in 1894 she admitted: 'the construction of the sentences – almost always in the impersonal, and in the general, like Latin – and so much more positive than ours – is still very difficult for me'. (Ibid. 130)

When in July 1894 Garnett's translation of *Rudin* was published, an anonymous reviewer in *Daily Chronicle* wrote. 'If in subsequent volumes Mrs Garnett can keep up to the level of excellence attained in 'Rudin' we shall have to thank her for one of the best series of translations in the language'. (Cit. Ibid. 139.) By 1899 she had translated the whole of Turgenev.

Constance Garnett had wanted to translate *Anna Karenina* since she read it in Russian in September 1896. Richard Garnett, her biographer, says that were already 'at least two English translations. Vizetelly had been first off the mark in 1884, followed by Nathan Haskell Dole two years later.' (Richard Garnett 1991, 191) This is most likely a mistake, since Vizetelly was a publisher, not a translator, and there is no evidence that *Anna Karenina* existed in English before 1886. Dole's translation must have been the only one before the 20th century, and Constance Garnett read it and thought it 'so exceptionally bad that it gives hardly any idea of the original'. (Ibid. 191) She started translating the novel on her own initiative, and in January 1900 Edward Garnett went to see Heinemann, but failed to persuade him to undertake the publication. She continued translating, confident that her *Anna Karenina* would be 'of use sooner or later'. Only in June, by which time Garnett had already translated a third of the novel, Heinemann agreed to take it on, paying her at the rate of 12 shillings per 1000 words and with no royalty. The translation of the whole book took less than eighteen months. During that time, according to her son, Constance Garnett was 'a very busy woman and for several hours a day the affairs of Vronsky, Levin and Dolly were perforce as real to her as those of her own household.' (David Garnett 1973, 117-118) The translation was finally completed in May 1901. A reviewer in *The Nation* compared it to Dole's translation:

> Because Mr. Dole's translation is faulty (…) it does not follow that Mrs. Garnett's is impeccable. It is certainly closer to the original than any that have come to our notice, yet it can hardly be called a ''literal'' translation, though the English, in many places, is clumsy enough for that. The magical simplicity of Tolstoy's style in ''Anna Karenin'' evaporates, and that smooth polish is lost in her English. (*The Nation,* 21.11.1901, 404)

The reviewer concluded: 'With all its shortcomings, this is a conscientious translation of Tolstoy's masterpiece, and if all the works of the great Russian were to be rendered as scrupulously as this, it would be a great boon to English readers.' (Ibid. 405)

A reviewer in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* noted that *Anna Karenina* was less fluent than Garnett's translations of Turgenev:

Whether the style of Tolstoi be more complicated than that of Turgenev we know not, but surely Mrs Garnett's later work is far more closely involved than her former. Nevertheless, - the reviewer continued, - we are exceedingly grateful to her, since she has given us for the first time the complete and workmanlike version of a masterpiece. (*Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, N1033, November 1901, 713)

Having read this review, Garnett wrote to her father-in-law that she herself considered her translations of Turgenev less successful than her *Anna Karenina*

I could never feel that I had done justice to the original (Turgenev's – M.B-H), while I really think the English version of Anna is clearer and more free from glaring defects of style than the Russian original. … Tolstoy makes no attempt to write good Russian – and more than that – he seems willingly to go out of his way at times in not doing so. Though of course he does write here and there wonderful passages, especially in conversations, where one feels no word could be changed without loss. (Cit. Richard Garnett, 1991, 205)

This letter shows that Constance Garnett was aware of the deliberate 'clumsiness' of Tolstoy's style but did not attempt to either render this clumsiness in English or to translate his language with polished Turgenev-like style. She strove to translate the work of a Russian writer so that it sounds natural and fluent in English. (Motyleva 1978, 95)

Indeed, later commentators noticed Garnett's tendency to smooth over stylistic differences of the various authors she translated. Carl Proffer says of her *Dead Souls*: 'Gogol's style becomes indistinguishable from that of Turgenev, Tolstoj, Dostoevskij, or Cexov' (Proffer 1964, 425-426.) Because Tolstoy did not write 'good Russian', Garnett maintained that Tolstoy was the easiest author to translate: 'I could translate him in my sleep' (From a letter to Edward Garnett from 14.01.1990, Cit. Richard Garnett 1991, 205.) After Garnett's death Edward Crankshaw declared:

> She was not as necessary to Tolstoy and Dostoevsky as she was for Turgenev and Chekhov. The flat, didactic cadences of Tolstoy batter their way into the paralysed consciousness of the most inept translator and reproduce themselves in English with sufficient resemblance to their original state. (Crankshaw 1947, 196)

It is probably due to Garnett's conviction that "Tolstoy's simple style goes straight into English without any trouble" (*Listener*, January 30, 1947, 195) that later commentators have emphasised her 'courage' in not changing Tolstoy's style too much: 'Only Garnett has the courage to write as Tolstoy did, baldly conveying the obscenity of death…' (Kelly 2000, 593.);

'… She (Garnett – M.B.-H.) would accept the angularities in Tolstoy and not shrink from his repetitions…' (Gifford 1978, 22)

When in 1965 Nina Berberova and Leonard J. Kent revised Garnett's translation of *Anna Karenina*, they wrote in the editors' note:

> Some sixty years after Constance Garnett put *Anna Karenina* into English, her work remains, on balance, a singularly successful achievement; and for this reason the decision was made to use her translation as the basic text of this new edition. That she made errors and that her heritage dictated pruderies which occasionally mute some of Tolstoy is certain, but that her language and syntax almost always faithfully reproduce both the letter *and* the tone of the original is no less true; indeed, we remain as unconvinced as many others that her translation has ever been superseded. Some more recent translators sometimes alter the text to make it "clearer", omit what they feel is superfluous or redundant, "freshen up" the text to the point where nineteenth-century Russia becomes quite contemporaneous, and so on. In a sentence, too often, it seems to us, do they leave their own signatures behind (Cit. Sheldon 1997, 237-238.)

During Garnett's lifetime though a very strange thing happened: since almost all Russian writers were represented by one English translator, no longer was her English assessed in relationship to their Russian, but rather the writers' individual styles were judged against her standard English. As May suggests, that was due to the fact that readers wanted a single mediator for Russian literature, one who would standardise it and make it familiar (May 1994, 37-38.) Since English readers recognised her name on the book cover

rather than a difficult name of a foreign author, Constance Garnett became a constant whilst Russian writers were seen as variables.

Thus, on June 10 1902 Joseph Conrad wrote to Edward Garnett, ‘Remember me affectionately to your wife whose translation of Karenina is splendid. Of the thing itself I think but little, so that her merit shines with the greater lustre.’ (Cit. Nabokov 1981, 147)

Ten years later Conrad commented to Edward Garnett upon reading Constance Garnett’s translation of *The Brothers Karamazov*:

Of course your wife’s translation is wonderful. One almost breaks one’s heart merely thinking about it. What courage! What perseverance! What talent of – interpretation, let us say. The word ‘translation’ does not apply to your wife’s achievements. But indeed the man’s art does not deserve this good fortune.
Turgenev (and perhaps Tolstoy) are the only two really worthy of her.” (Cit. May, 1994, 34)

Kornei Chukovsky shows how unhelpful was this reverent attitude to Garnett’s translations:

If only someone could have helped deliver her from her chief sin: the leveling of writers’ styles, as a result of which Dostoevsky comes in some strange way to resemble Turgenev. True, journals and newspapers published not a few articles about the writers she brought to the acquaintance of Englishmen, but almost nothing was said about her methods of translation. It was believed they were irreproachable.
Arnold Bennett, and Katherine Mansfield, and John Galsworthy, and Hemingway, all of whom expressed delight over her translations in print and in correspondence, knew not a word of Russian.” (Leighton, 1984, 220-221)

Though Garnett domesticated Russian classics, translating them into natural and fluent English, she nevertheless refused to modernise them. In her only statement about her translating career, broadcast on the BBC shortly before her death, she said:

The desire to modernise an author arises from ignorance of the past and from bad taste. I have always tried to translate the Russians into the language of the period in which they wrote, which is of course possible with Russian literature, since it is all relatively modern. … One's aim should always be to translate into the language of the corresponding life. (*Listener,* 30.01.1947, 195)

Richard Garnett admits that Constance Garnett always found dialogue more difficult than description and was unable to make adequate distinctions between peasant and normal speech, explaining that her training in the classics made her prefer proper English to colloquialisms. As Glyn Turnton has shown, she also occasionally gave up the struggle to translate puns and faulty Russian. (Richard Garnett 1991, 185)

2.4. Leo Wiener's Translation[viii] Leo Wiener was born in Bialystok, Poland, in 1862. He studied engineering in Berlin and medicine in Warsaw. At the age of eighteen he emigrated from Poland to the United States. He had had a plan to join in an undertaking to found a utopian community along Tolstoyan lines in Central America, which fell through. Wiener became a professor of modern languages at the University of Missouri, then a tenured professor of Slavic languages at Harvard. In 1902 Wiener edited an anthology of Russian literature in English translation. He translated 24 volumes of Tolstoy's works, *Anna Karenina* (1904) among them.

In the preface to his translation Wiener wrote:

The present new translation of Tolstoy has the following distinctive features:

The translator was born and educated in Russia, and the scenes and the life depicted, and the ideas evolved by the author, are familiar to him as to a native; on the other hand, his later youth and his manhood have been passed in America, where for twenty years he has taken active part in the educational and the literary movements of Anglo-Saxon life. Thus he is enabled correctly to interpret the workings of the greatest Russian mind both from the standpoint of a Russian and of an American. (…)

The translator has treated the author with sympathetic love, which in many instances is due to a common bond of practices of life and of ideas: the translator is a vegetarian and teetotaler of even longer standing than the author, and shares his educational ideas both in theory and in practice. At the same time, the translator is absolutely free from any personal bias, and in dealing with Tolstoy brings to bear a critical spirit, born of the blending of the Russian and the Anglo-Saxon concepts of life.

No liberties are taken with either the language or the expression of the author's diction, which in unconscious artistic moments is sublimely poetical and sonorous, and the

piling up of Cyclopean thoughts lacks the binding mortar. In such cases the translation leaves him in his original gigantic ruggedness. No attempt has been made to correct Tolstoy's style, which is so frequently practised by his other translators. (Wiener 1904, v.1, iii-iv)

Yet, as Catriona Kelly comments, Leo Wiener translated Tolstoy into 'a sort of Baltic English, Germano-Russian in lexis, syntax, and even punctuation'. (Kelly 2000, 592) Some examples: 'Kissing him finally on his face, which was flushed from the inclined attitude, and beaming with tenderness, the girl unlocked her arms…' (Wiener 1904, v.9, 15) 'And those assurances of love, which to him appeared so trite that he was ashamed to utter them, she imbibed, and slowly calmed down.' (Ibid. v.10, 481)

2.5. Rochelle Townsend's Translation This translation corrects some of Garnett's blunders. For example, In Part 3, chapter 8, Dolly meets with peasant women and chats to them about the most important things*:*

'как рожала? чем был болен? где муж? Часто ли бывает?' (Tolstoy 1963, v.8: 312.)

In Garnett's translations the conversation between Dolly and the peasant women turned out rather unexpectedly: 'What sort of time did she have? What was the matter with the boy? Where was her husband? **Did it often happen?'** (Garnett 1923, 301)

Townsend's translation is more truthful to Tolstoy: '… where their husbands were and if they often saw them.' (Townsend 1943, 235) Yet Townsend makes her own mistakes, such as making Oblonsky call the Karenins' son *Sergei Alexandrovitch* instead of *Sergei Alexeevitch.* She also turns Seryozha's Slav tutor Vassily Lukich into *Vassily Lukitch Slavyanin,* the tutor, thinking of the Russian word *славянин* as his last name.

2.6. Louise and Aylmer Maude's Translation: If Constance Garnett's name was synonymous with the majority of translations of Russian literature into English, one can say that Maude's name is associated with introducing Tolstoy's works in England. Aylmer Maude and his wife were Garnett's main rivals as far as translating Tolstoy went.

Aylmer Maude was born in 1858 in Ipswich. His father was a curate of Holy Trinity Church. Between 1868 and 1874 Maude studied at Christ's Hospital, London. His elder sister Lucy was working as a governess in a wealthy Russian family in Moscow, and she took the 16-year old Aylmer Maude to Moscow to be educated there. There, between 1874 and 1876, he attended the Lyceum. Afterwards Maude took up residence in Russia before returning to England in 1897.

For three years Maude worked as an English tutor, in 1880-1883 he was engaged on a clerical job and then joined the business world as a director of a carpet manufacturing firm. In 1884 he married Louise Shanks, a daughter of an English businessman settled in Moscow.

The friendship between Maude and Tolstoy lasted for 22 years – from 1888 until Tolstoy's death. It was on Tolstoy's recommendation that Maude returned to England in 1897. Having accepted Tolstoy's principles as regards moneymaking, he found it difficult to reconcile his new beliefs with his commercial undertaking. In England Maude and his wife joined Purleigh Colony in Essex and agreed to live on a small allowance and share the Tolstoyan life of the community. Maude became not only Tolstoy's translator but also his biographer and expounder of his ideas. The first major work Maude translated was: *What is Art?* (1897). From that time he was hoping to publish one complete and unique edition of Tolstoy's works in order to present Tolstoy in a readable and reliable form – which later became the monumental Centenary Edition of Tolstoy, published between 1928 and 1937.

Aylmer Maude and his wife translated *Anna Karenina* in 1918 but later revised and annotated it for the Centenary Edition. Their revised *Anna Karenina* appeared only in 1937, some time after all the other volumes and only a year before Maude's death. Aylmer Maude was getting old and therefore had decided first to deal with the works he had not previously translated (Maude 1937, xv.)

Since Tolstoy had invited publishers in all countries to take advantage of the absence of international copyright between Russia and other countries, until 1928 there

was no complete edition of his works in the English speaking world. In 1922 Bernard Shaw wrote a letter to the press, stating that the complete edition projected for the Tolstoy Centenary by the Oxford University Press

(…) may prove commercially impossible unless the public, by spontaneously giving it the privileges of a copyright edition, both by subscribing for complete sets and specifying this edition in their purchases of separate volumes, makes up for the absence of legal rights and for the miscarriage of Tolstoy's public-spirited intention in the matter.

The Oxford Press translation will be complete and unique, and certain to remain so, as it is not now possible for any new English writer to bring to a translation of Tolstoy's works the personal knowledge of the author, and the peculiar experience of Russian life… (*The Author*, July 1922, 292-293)

Shaw's letter was endorsed and signed by other well-known English and American writers, including Somerset Maugham, Jerome K. Jerome and Theodore Dreiser, and scholars of Russian.

In a lecture on English translations of Tolstoy (1927), Maude criticised all his predecessors, pointing out that some translations in print did Tolstoy 'very grave injustice'. He, however, disagreed with Arnold's supposition that *Anna Karenina* would naturally go better into French than into English. There are two sets of people in the novel: a Court set who continually speak French and are 'Frenchified', and a 'straightforward Russian set' who seldom use French phrases. The contrast between the two sets can be made clear in English, but is difficult to deal with in a version where all the characters have to speak French[ix]. (Maude 1929, 434) Having acknowledged that some English translations of Tolstoy are good, Maude criticised Dole as an unfaithful translator, pointing out that in the preface to his version of Chernyshevski's novel '*What To Do?'* (Dole had it re-christened *A Vital Question)* Dole remarked: 'In one single scene Kirsanov's character has been slightly mended better to suit the American ideal of man.' (Cit. Maude 1929, 459) Maude admitted that in spite of all the faults in Dole's translation of *War and Peace* – bad transliteration of names, Russian words left untranslated and frequent blunders – the translation was still 'fairly readable and people have enjoyed the novel in this version'. Maude therefore quoted a comment by Professor Gilbert Murray: 'The wonder to me has

always been how Tolstoy contrives to make such a tremendous and characteristic impression through such an opaque and distorting medium as the average Anglo-American translation!' (Ibid. 459) Dole wrote good English but his Russian was not dependable; Leo Wiener, on the other hand, knew Russian but had no literary command of English. Constance Garnett's work 'belongs to a different and a much superior category'. Maude recognised that a translator like Garnett, who had to turn out one book after another, should not be judged by such a strict standard. Still, he cited several instances of blunders from Garnett's translation of *War and Peace*.[x] (Ibid. 461-464.)

Maude believed that he and his wife were best suited for producing definitive English versions of Tolstoy's books as the most faithful translators who do not make mistakes.

'If our renderings deserve the praise they have received, it is mainly due to favourable circumstances', - he wrote modestly. 'My wife was born in Moscow and lived there for the first forty years of her life; I lived there for more than twenty-three years. We knew Tolstoy intimately.' (Ibid. 464)

Finally, Maude quoted excerpts from Tolstoy's letters to him, where the latter had written: 'I do not desire a better translator, both on account of your knowledge of the two languages and of your strictness with yourself in everything'. 'Your translations are very good because you have an admirable mastery of both languages, and besides that, to my great pleasure, you love the thoughts you transmit.' (Ibid. 472-473.)[xi]

Maude did not write anything about his translation strategy, i.e. mediation between 'literary decorum' and Tolstoy's style. It is clear from the quotations above that he considered a perfect command of both languages and understanding of the sense and meaning of the original author to be translator's most important attributes – similarly to Etienne Dolet's first two fundamental principles of translation (see chapter 1).

Maude saw loyalty to the original author in translating into clear English – as opposed to translationese. He considered translations that sound foreign to be damaging for all parties: it wrongs the author

to present him as though he were not competent to handle the language in which he wrote; it should be unsatisfactory for the translator to appear in the character of a spavined post-horse; and it disappoints a reader to find that the dish served up to him has gone bad in the kitchen. (Reading And Translations, Maude Archive.)

At the same time, Maude was conscious of the 'clumsiness' of Tolstoy's style. In his *Life of Tolstoy* Maude quotes a letter from Druzhinin, a critic, writer and translator, to Tolstoy then still in the beginning of his literary career:

You are most ungrammatical, sometimes with the lack of grammar of a reformer and powerful poet reshaping a language his own way and for ever, but sometimes with the lack of grammar of an officer sitting in a casemate and writing to his chum. (…) Above all avoid long sentences. Cut them up into two or three; do not be sparing of full-stops…. Do not stand on ceremony with the particles, and strike out by dozens the words: *which, who,* and *that.* (Cit. Maude 1929, 175)

Maude comments:

'As a translator I can testify that Tolstoy never fully learnt the lesson Druzhinin here set him. To the very last he occasionally intermingled passages of extraordinary simplicity and force, with sentences that defy analysis and abound in redundances.' (Ibid. 175)

Presumably Maude thought it was his duty to learn Druzhinin's lesson and to clear Tolstoy's text of 'redundances'. Faithfulness for Maude meant conveying Tolstoy's thoughts and the details of his narration in an acceptable for English readers form. His

creed could perhaps be expressed in the words of J.H. Penson: ‘Outwardly men differ widely – in language, in appearance. Inwardly it is the similarity that is remarkable. (…) Translators of the Russian writers – those of Tolstoy, for example – have to give the world this world-wide appeal.’ (Penson 1923, 75)

From Bernard Shaw’s letter to the editor of *the Saturday Review* (14 January 1905) it becomes apparent that Maude was criticised for rendering peasants’ speech in his translation of *The Power of Darkness*, where he made the peasant girls say ‘S’elp me’.

‘What would I do?’ – asks Shaw in his defence of Maude. – I think I should make the Russian peasant speak good plain Cobbett English; but though that would spare Max a jar, there is no use pretending that it would represent the original. It would misrepresent it very grossly.” (Extract from the *Saturday Review*, Maude Archive).

Maude’s faithfulness to Tolstoy’s texts was recognised by his contemporaries and reflected in his obituary: ‘For forty years he set himself the task … of reproducing with complete faithfulness the major body of Tolstoy’s writings and of interpreting both his art and his teaching.’ (*Times Literary Supplement*, September 3, 1938, 566)

Motyleva shows that there are phrases and even paragraphs in the Maudes’ translation of *War and Peace* that all but coincide with Garnett’s text. (Motyleva 1978, 103) Motyleva explains it by the fact that in the beginning of the 20th century translation was not yet seen as art in its own right and Maude felt free to incorporate Garnett’s stylistic findings in their work. One could actually say that Maude followed the principles of translation introduced by Chapman (see chapter 1), i.e. avoiding word for word renderings, attempting to transmit the ‘spirit’ of the original and basing their translation on a sound scholarly investigation of other versions.

Yet, as Gifford says, ‘Aylmer Maude and his wife were qualified in everything except a creative sense of language to make the ideal translation. … The result is a lucid and accurate version, at home with the peculiarities of Russian life, and written in a serviceable prosaic English’. (Gifford 1978, 22)

2.7. Rosemary Edmonds' Translation: The 'Russian craze' died out in England at the end of the 1920s. Garnett's, the Maudes' and Townsend's translations of *Anna Karenina* remained in print, largely unchallenged. An attitude to translation of fiction, typical of Anglo-American scholars before the Second World War, is expressed in J.A. Smith's doctoral thesis:

> The answer that is made to the question whether the several translations of a novel (given a fair degree of competence in the translator) are likely to diverge significantly from each other and from the original will depend upon the view that is taken of a novel. If the essential feature of a novel is taken to be the style: the choice of words, the arrangement of them into patterns and rhythms, turns and figurative expressions;- if these are the essentials, the novel will beyond doubt suffer a significant change in translation. If, on the hand, the language is assumed to be merely the external medium of communication between the book itself and the reader, if the book itself chiefly consists of action, thought, character, episodes, the gradual unfolding according to a definite plan of certain sections of experience – if these are essential elements of the novel, then it is doubtful, even more than doubtful, whether any significant variation will occur among translations made by reasonably competent translators, such as we take the translators of Tolstoy's major works – Dole, Hapgood, Aylmer and Louise Maude, Garnett, and Wiener – to be. (…)
> In the novel, immense in size, complex in effect, to be read in many sittings, the relative value of le mot juste tends to decline. (…) The general weight of a story as vast as Anna Karenina or War And Peace carries it into the heart and mind of the reader despite little incongruities of fact, little awkwardnesses of expression in the translation. (Smith 1939, 67)

It took World War 2 and its aftermath to rekindle widespread interest in Russian language and culture. The number of specialists on Russian language and literature had grown enough to change attitudes towards translation dramatically. There was renewed interest in Russian classics in the 1950s, perhaps because of increasing numbers of college and university students of Russian or perhaps because of the Cold War. Old translations were reassessed. Garnett's *Anna Karenin* was revised by Leonard J. Kent and Nina Berberova and published in the United States in 1965. The Maude translation, too, was republished and included in George Gibian's critical edition in 1970, which included selected letters and essays. By that time academics believed that Kent and Berberova's reworking of Garnett's version had already superseded the Maude translation in accuracy.

Maude was criticised for his introduction being uninformative and his 'List of Russian Words' being minimal and unreliable: for instance, for his definition of *kvas* simply as a 'non-alcoholic drink' and the anachronistic description of Great Morskaya street as 'one of the best streets in Petrograd'[xii] (Leong 1971, 71.)

At the same time publishers began to bring out new translations of Russian classics that were seen as 'an advance from Garnett'. As Cohen says, it was Rieu's example that set a number of distinguished writers to the work of retranslating the great works of the past for a 20th century audience (Cohen 1962, 43), meaning E.V. Rieu's translation of the *Odyssey* (1946), that started Penguin Classics. 'With E.V. Rieu's translation of The Odyssey leading the way, new versions of the Greek and Roman classics and the great Russians have come in a steady way', wrote Oliver Edwards in 1957 (Edwards 1957a, 13.) Rosemary Edmonds belonged to that generation of Penguin Classics translators, who have aimed principally at interpretation in current language, even at the risk of reducing individual authors' style and national tricks of speech to a plain prose uniformity' (Cohen 1962, 33.)

London-born Edmonds had studied foreign languages, including Russian and old Slavonic. During World War 2 she worked as General de Gaulle's personal interpreter. Edmonds translated a series of Russian classics, including Pushkin, Turgenev, Gogol, Leskov and Tolstoy.

Already in a note, preceding her translation of *Anna Karenina*, Edmonds tells the readers that she is going to change the Russian text by making the characters address each other as if they were English:

Although Russians never call each other by family name but by Christian name and patronymic – thus, Oblonsky would be always Stepan Arkadyevich – for the sake of clarity I have used the surname wherever possible.

For the same reason I prefer the form *Anna Karenin,* since the feminine form (*Anna Karenina)* is not usual in English, where Countess Tolstoya[xiii] appears as Countess Tolstoy, Madame Blavatskaya as Madame Blavatsky, and so on. (Edmonds 1978, 9)

Edmonds' translation of *Anna Karenina* came out in 1954. In *The Times Literary Supplement* it was reviewed as a 'generally fluent and flexible work', but 'there is no imperative fresh demand from the reader's side that it comes to satisfy' (*Times Literary* S*upplement* 16 July 1954, 450.) The reviewer wrote that no existing translation of *Anna Karenina* had come up to the academic standards of accuracy that scholars set themselves in translating ancient languages. For instance, describing the racecourse, Tolstoy, in a verbatim translation, tells us: 'by each obstacle stood a doctor, an ambulance waggon with a cross sewn on and (with) a sister of mercy….' Not one of the four popular English translations would score full marks from a strict examiner on that simple phrase: none of them reproduces a picture that is verbally indistiguishable from Tolstoy's. Rochelle Townsend glosses the doctor as a surgeon and the sister of mercy as a nurse, besides omitting the ambulance altogether; Constance Garnett, by misplacing a comma, upsets the minute distinction between the positions of the doctor and the sister of mercy in the grammatical construction; the Maudes explain that the cross was a red one; so does Miss Edmonds, besides omitting to specify that it was sewn on… The reviewer claims that pure pedantry is 'certainly not out of place in discussing the work of a translator who chooses (perfectly correctly) to alter the familiar English name of this novel'.

The reviewer in the *Times Literary Supplement* was looking for both academic pedantry and literary fluency. By fluency, however, he meant good English style rather than naturalising or modernising culture-specific words:

> …*troikas* and *zemstvos* we have always with us, because they are untranslatable anyway; quadrilles and crinolines we cannot modernize, because they are part of the atmosphere of the period; and even if young men are no longer called bucks or puppies, it is still presumably the case that they were so called in the 1870s.

Some of Rosemary Edmonds' variants from her predecessors are therefore 'less than happy'. 'Beefy ass' (the way Vronsky thinks of the foreign prince he is entertaining – M.B-H) 'is the language of Greyfriars rather than the School of Pages at which Vronsky

was educated'. The reviewer also disapproved of Edmonds' use of dated words that did not necessarily convey the atmosphere of the period: 'nor do people in the mid-20th century use "wench" as a term of abuse or describe old men as "comely".' His verdict was that Edmonds had not made a conspicuous advance – partly because of the reasonably high quality of the previous translations, partly because her translation, like its predecessors, was not flawless. Paraphrasing Tolstoy's famous opening line, the reviewer wrote that all the existing translations 'have their excellences, which are generally different; all have their defects, which are often the same'. As an example of poor English he criticised all the four translators mentioned above for rendering Tolstoy's *'Ей, которая так боялась, чтоб он не принял легко ее беременность…'* (Tolstoy v.8, 223) as 'She who had feared…': '"The grammatical construction of 'She who….' which all four reproduce, is one that would surely be foreign to an English novelist of Tolstoy's stylistic simplicity'[xiv].

The reviewer thus pointed out that *Anna Karenina* had not yet found its ideal translator. He also made an interesting observation about its retranslations: 'Successive translations of the Russian classics are not, like those of the Greek classics, so many different routes pioneering different directions towards the same remote goal; they are rather successive stages on a single road, often not far apart[xv].' (*Times Literary Supplement*, 16 July 1954, 450)

Rosemary Edmonds' *Anna Karenin* was reprinted in 1978 with the translator's revisions based on the new Russian edition of the novel, published in *Литературные Памятники* in 1970. To show where this edition came from, Turner, one of the most meticulous commentators to *Anna Karenina,* has reprinted in his book N.N. Strakhov's letter about the 1878 edition of the novel. (Strakhov was a close friend of Tolstoy, a literary critic and a journalist):

In the summer of 1877 I was staying with Count L.N. Tolstoi at Iasnaia Poliana (June, July) and gave him the idea of looking through *Anna Karenina* to prepare it for a separate edition. I undertook to read ahead, correct the punctuation and obvious errors and

to introduce to Lev Nikolaevich the places that seemed to me for any reason to require correction – primarily, even almost exclusively, incorrect language and lack of clarity. In this way first I read and entered in my corrections, and then Lev Nikolaevich. That is how things went until half-way through the novel, but then Lev Nikolaevich, who was becoming increasingly carried away with the book, overtook me and I made corrections after him; and even before that I had always looked through his corrections in order to be sure that I had understood them and was working in the right way, because I was going to correct the proofs.

This persistent labour bore its fruit. However fond I had been of the novel in its original form, I was fairly swiftly convinced that Lev Nikolaevich' changes were made with an amazing skill, that they clarified and deepened features that had seemed in any case clear, and were always made strictly in the spirit and tone of the whole. As regards my own corrections, which affected almost only the language, I noticed another peculiarity that, although I did not find it unexpected, stood out very clearly. Lev Nikolaevich firmly defended his slightest expression and would not agree to the most, one would have thought, innocuous changes. From his explanations I was convinced that he valued his own language to an unusual degree and that, in spite of all the apparent carelessness and unevenness of his style, he thought over every word, every turn of speech no less than the most fastidious poet (Cit. Turner 1993, 54.)

The 1970 edition sought to remove about 100 changes in the text, made by Strakhov, about 70 changes made by Tolstoy's wife and over 800 changes made, whether accidentally or deliberately, by copyists, editors and typesetters. (Turner, 1993, 55)

Some of the amendments in the Russian text cannot be reflected in the English translation, since they are mostly to do with Russian syntactic subtleties. The biggest change was introduced in the beginning of part 1, chapter 2, and it is to do with Oblonsky's changing attitude to his marital infidelity. Hugh McLean believes that Tolstoy's sentence in the following paragraph was omitted through a process of 'haplography', 'where the copyist's eye jumps from the first of two identical words or phrases, omitting what lies between' (McLean 2001, 39). Compare:

He was incapable of self-defection and could not persuade himself that he repented of his conduct. He could not feel repentant that he, a handsome amorous man of thirty-four, was not in love with his wife, the mother of five living and two dead children and only a year younger than himself. (Maude 1937, v.1, 3)

He could not deceive himself into believing that he repented of his conduct. He could not now do penance for something he had reproached himself for half a dozen years ago when he had first been unfaithful to his wife. He could not beg forgiveness because he, a handsome, susceptible man of thirty-four, was not in love with his wife, who was the mother of five living and two dead children and only a year younger than himself. (Edmonds 1978, 15)

As far as the style of this translation is concerned, Motyleva comments on the proximity of Edmonds' translation to the Maude version[xvi] with the difference that the modern translator is more determined to make the dialogue sound alive and to introduce colloquialisms (Motyleva 1978, 118.) Gifford (1978, 23) also states that the dialogue in Edmonds' translation is 'much more convincing than that contrived by the Maudes'. Both scholars point out Edmonds' lack of attention to detail and her tendency to beautify Tolstoy's text.

Among other Tolstoy's works, Gifford gives a couple of examples from *Anna Karenina.* Describing Levin's visit to Kitty and his future parents-in-law, Tolstoy says: *'И Левина охватило новое чувство любви к этому прежде чужому ему человеку, старому князю, когда он смотрел, как Кити долго и нежно целовала ему мясистую руку*». (Tolstoy, v. 8, 474) Gifford comments:

If we follow Miss Edmonds, it would seem that he noticed 'how fervently and tenderly Kitty kissed his strong hand'. But she kissed it *long,* not fervently, and the hand was *fleshy*. Hands are expressive for Tolstoy – think of Napoleon's, or Speransky's, or the small energetic hands of Anna. Miss Edmonds, and Mrs Garnett too who changes it to ''muscular'', presumably did not want the prince to have a 'fleshy' hand.' (Gifford, 1978, 23)

Similarly, in the same chapter Levin sees things he will never see again: 'В особенности дети, шедшие в школу, голуби сизые, слетевшие с крыши на тротуар, и сайки, посыпанные мукой, которые выставила невидимая рука, тронули его. Эти сайки, голуби и два мальчика были неземные существа.' (Tolstoy v.8, 472.)

Gifford comments:

The translators have not handled the detail here scrupulously enough. The Maudes unaccountably omit the pavement to which the pigeons have descended, and the rolls are not in their translation sprinkled with flour. They begin specifically with 'two children', following this by 'some pigeons'; but at the beginning it is not the number of these living things that interests Tolstoy so much as their epiphany. Rosemary Edmonds has made them 'silver-grey pigeons', which is inaccurate, and has the effect of anticipating the way they will shine in the sun. However, Tolstoy (…) prefers to show things as they normally are, the morning incidents of a Moscow street, before the vision transforms them. (…) The

Maudes (and Miss Edmonds too) have not the courage of Tolstoy's conviction: according to the former, the rolls, the pigeons and the two boys 'seemed creatures not of this earth'. However, for Levin unquestionably they *were* unearthly, as Mrs Garnett has recognised. (Gifford 1978, 29)

Twenty years earlier a reviewer of Edmonds' translation of *War and Peace* commented on her inability to match Tolstoy's style:

We (…) have the paradox: to do Tolstoy well we have to do him badly, for whether we try to capture his absense of "style" or not, we fall short. We fail when we do, because the absense of device is more of a fault in English than in Russian. We fail also when we don't because by ignoring this absense of "style" we no longer produce a translation, but a metaphrase.
Rosemary Edmonds "corrects" Tolstoy in the poetic and descriptive passages; she leaves him alone in the dialogues. But her way of reproducing Tolstoy's spontaneity in dialogue is to neutralize it.

The reviewer concludes, pointing out that Edmonds

(…) removes all evidence that Tolstoy readily sacrificed form to content. This sacrifice, in addition of the syntactical oddities produced by the involved logic of his insights, constitutes the peculiarly "foreign" flavor of his manner. And this is something which the ideal translation should convey.
The Maudes' English translation is still preferable because to their equally good knowledge of Russian they added a personal knowledge of the author's intent and a blunt artlessness concealing art which, so far, comes closest of all to imitating Tolstoy's way of writing. (Jezierski 1959, 84-85)

2.8. Joel Carmichael's Translation In 1962 J.M. Cohen wrote that new translators needed to make everything plain since 'the young person of today is generally reading in far less comfortable surroundings than his father or grandfather'. According to Cohen, translators of the 1960s had to write for 'a reader in the train or on a holiday beach'. (Cohen 1960, 33; 44) Presumably such was the target audience of Joel Carmichael's 'modern American translation'.

In the postscript Carmichael describes his main strategy as 'a strong line on what may be called the Ivan Petrovich approach' (Carmichael 1960, 869.), in other words, a refusal to translate Russian names and patronymics. The translator notes with surprise that

‘Russians actually do talk to each other that way’. This habit, he says, ‘perfectly natural and simple for them, has unaccountably been imported lock, stock and barrel into translations from the Russian, where, though trifling in itself, it injects a huge element of utterly superfluous, stilted inertia into both narrative and dialogue.’ The ‘dancing director’ cannot call Anna *Anna Arkadyevna* without ‘opening the breach to a flood of the cumbersome chunks of alien cliché’. (Ibid. 869-870.) Carmichael’s solution is to disregard the patronymics altogether and ‘have the various characters address or refer to each other as they would if speaking English’. As the result of this ‘Anglicisation’ Agafya Mikhailovna becomes Miss Agatha and starts to address Levin as Mr Constantine, and Marya Nikolayevna addresses the man she lives with as Mr Nicholas.

Otherwise, Carmichael, like Garnett, says that Tolstoy ‘has no style at all’ and that his writing is best characterised as ‘flat-footed’. But the translator’s job is not too difficult since ‘English, with its far greater syntactical resources and more opulent vocabulary, can unquestionably do a great deal to help complicate and sophisticate Tolstoy’s prose.’ (Ibid. 872) Like Garnett, Carmichael could have said that ‘Tolstoy’s simple style goes into English without any trouble’. It is probably due to Carmichael’s reluctance to actively change Tolstoy’s style that Richard Sheldon has called his translation the ‘most supple in English and most true to Tolstoy’s style’ (Sheldon 1997, 259.) Therefore, one could say that Carmichael kept some fidelity to Tolstoy’s style whilst disregarding Russian communication patterns.

2.9. Margaret Wettlin’s Translation: This is the only English translation of *Anna Karenina* published in Russia. The translator was an American woman who had lived in the Soviet Union for over forty years. She was obviously quite used to people addressing each other by first name and patronymic, so she retains the majority of them in the translation. Yet throughout the book she calls Anna’s son *Sergei* instead of *Seryozha* and makes Anna quite improbably address to him with his full name, too.

2.10. Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky's translation:

Shortly before Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation of *Anna Karenina* was published, Catriona Kelly wrote: One can only regret that Nabokov never achieved his aim of retranslating *Anna Karenina* and *War and Peace,* for a more adventurous rendering, treating the English language as recklessly as Tolstoy did his own mother-tongue'. (Kelly 2000, 594) This is exactly the task Pevear and Volokhonsky have undertaken.

Richard Pevear was born in Waltham, Massachusetts. He translates from French, Italian, Spanish, and, together with his Leningrad-born wife Larissa Volokhonsky, from Russian. Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation of *Anna Karenina* (2000) received the PEN-prize in 2001.

Assessing the work of his predecessors, Pevear comments that the Maude translation is excellent. Yet 'the Maudes still belonged to the period when it was assumed that translations into English should be wholly assimilated to the perceived standards of good English prose (it is never quite clear who sets these standards)'. They therefore suffer from the professional malady of 'translator's timidity' (a fear that the boldness of their author will look odd in English), reduce Tolstoy's repetitions by one and soften his syntax considerably. (Pevear 2000, vi.)

Pevear anticipates that critics will expect his translation to be conceived either more domesticating or more foreignizing than those of his predecessors :

Two opposite explanations immediately suggest themselves: either that we wanted to recast the book into contemporary English, making it more 'friendly' to new generations of readers; or that we wanted to make a more literal rendering, perhaps clumsier than the Maude version but closer to Tolstoy's Russian. Both are wrong, as I shall try to explain. (Ibid. vi.)

Rather than foreignizing, Pevear explains their version as 'Tolstoy-izing' the English (Richard Pevear in a letter to Maya Birdwood-Hedger.) :

Our practice is to listen more attentively to the original, to allow our language to be strongly affected not only by the Russian, but in this case, by Tolstoy’s Russian. This is by no means a matter of mere literalism; it is a constant balancing act involving the minds and sensibilities of two translators, one a native speaker of Russian, the other a native speaker of English. (Pevear 2000, vi.)

Pevear describes Tolstoy’s style as

often deliberately clumsy, sometimes aggressive, full of verbal and syntactic repetitions. Tolstoy cultivated these rough qualities; he called writers overly concerned with fine style ‘hairdressers’. For his translators, however, he poses a peculiar problem. There is a risk that the roughness will be attributed to their lack of skill rather than to Tolstoy’s artistic intention: a smoothly assimilated translation may also seem ‘better’. (Ibid. vi.)

Therefore he recognises that some ‘correcting’ of the original is inevitable, though ‘our translation is less ‘‘corrected’’ than any of the others.’

As an example of Tolstoy’s repetitions Pevear offers the description of the merchant Ryabinin’s carriage standing in front of Levin’s house:

> 'У крыльца уже стояла туго обтянутая железом и кожей тележка с туго запряженною широкими гужами сытою лошадью. В тележке сидел туго налитой кровью и туго подпоясанный приказчик, служивший кучером Рябинину.' (Tolstoy 1967 v.8, 198.)

As Pevear comments, 'Tolstoy clearly despises the merchant, and therefore his carriage and driver' (Pevear, xvii), and this attitude of the narrator is revealed through the repetition of the word *туго* four times. In previous English translators this repetition has been toned down. Compare, for instance:

At the porch stood a little cart strongly bound with leather and iron, and to the cart was harnessed a well-fed horse with broad, tightly-stretched straps. In the cart sat Ryabinin's clerk (who also performed a coachman's duties), his skin tightly stretched over and his belt drawn tight. (Maude 1937, v.1, 189)

A little gig was already standing by the porch, tightly bound in iron and leather, with a sleek horse tightly harnessed in broad tugs. In the little gig, tightly filled with blood and tightly girdled, sat Ryabinin's clerk, who was also his driver. (Pevear 2000, 167)[xvii]

Pevear also draws the reader's attention to Tolstoy's attitudes intruding on the objectivity of his discourse, where the intrusion could be as slight as a single word, like the 'old people who skated for hygienic (*gigienicheskiy)* purposes'. 'It is the word ''hygienic'' that Tolstoy scorns, as much as the practice – one of the ''new'' terms made current by the popularization of medical science in the later nineteenth century.' (Ibid. xvi.)

Similarly, as Pevear demonstrates, the narrator undercuts Kitty's admiration for the very spiritual Mme Stahl : '''And here's Mme Stahl,'' said Kitty, pointing to a bath-chair in which something lay, dressed in something grey and blue, propped on pillows under an umbrella.' (Ibid. xvii.)

Pevear and Volokhonsky refuse to either modernise or archaise (and their reluctance to use archaisms is a sign of mild domestication – after all, they are further removed from Tolstoy's time than all their predecessors):

We have no interest in putting Anna Karenina into contemporary 'reader friendly'English; in fact, one of our principles has been to use no English words that were not current in Tolstoy's time. On the other hand, we would not write anything that we could not actually say. (…) Our only aim as translators has been to bring into English as much as possible of this nineteenth century Russian novel, meaning also its rhythms, tone, and temperament. (Pevear 2000, vi.)

The translators had to fight against Penguin editors for the preservation of Tolstoy's 'striking, graphic, specific' language. For example, the editors were not prepared to accept Frou-Frou's 'speaking eye' as she dies. (Richard Pevear in a letter to Maya Birdwood-Hedger.) Constance Garnett had already translated 'своим говорящим глазом' as 'with her speaking eyes' (even though that makes two eyes and not one), but Maude and Edmonds had opted out for 'with eloquent eyes'. Pevear and Volokhonsky eventually won the cause, and the horse in their translation looks at her master 'with her speaking eye'.

The latest translation of *Anna Karenina* has been met with mixed response. Writer, broadcaster and translator Robert Dessaix finds that Pevear and Volokhonsky’s new translation lacks the voice: the 'confident, highly educated, masculine voice' of Tolstoy's narrator, which he demonstrates is to be found in Rosemary Edmonds' translation.

Reviewing their translation in The New Yorker, the critic James Wood had praised Pevear and Volokhonsky as 'at once scrupulous translators and vivid stylists of English. Their superb rendering allows us, as perhaps never before,' he says, 'to grasp the palpability of Tolstoy's "characters, acts, situations"'. Rosemary Edmonds' Penguin Classics translation James Wood dismisses as 'more muted.'

In a special edition of Lingua Franca Dessaix agrees that Pevear and Volokhonsky have certainly managed to convey quite strikingly the physicality of Tolstoy's text –

that particular use of language which makes the reader want to cry out: yes, yes, you're transporting me there, I can see it all - smell it, hear it, touch it . the 'thinginess' of the pictures Tolstoy drew: they capture that well. and certainly the translation of many individual words and phrases is more accurate (I'm talking here about the microlevel of translation). Pevear and Volkhonsky are correct, for instance: Tolstoy doesn't write about Anna's brother's 'powerful lungs' (as the old translation has him
do) at all, but (indeed) about the 'broad box of his chest'. yes, that's so, and yet I'm not sure that in making these minute corrections at the microlevel, they haven't lost something at the macrolevel, so to speak. I mean, I'm not at all convinced that the
resulting voice in English is any more real (more trustworthy) than it was in the old translation, perhaps less. And I think that this is important.’’

Quoting the opening sentence of the novel, Dessaix notices that the new translation is pretty well word-perfect: ‘All happy families are alike; each unhappy family is unhappy in its own way.’

Dessaix says :

Without going into the question of whether or not this famous opening sentence is in fact meaningless gobbledygook, I find it hard to believe that anybody would ever actually say in English: 'each unhappy family is unhappy in its own way'. I can't, in other words, hear a real voice speaking. Yet in Russian I can.

Rosemary Edmonds, on the other hand, in the early 1950s, taking liberties with the text, wrote this: ‘All happy families are alike but an unhappy family is unhappy after its

own fashion.' Now this is a voice that is talking to me in my own language, a language I can relax with, as a Russian can relax with Tolstoy's Russian. And Rosemary Edmonds goes on (on the same page) to describe Anna's brother's body as 'plump and pampered'. (this is Stiva Oblonsky's bouncing ball of a body, once read about, never forgotten) . whereas the new translation, with impeccable correctness, at a word-for-word level, describes it as a 'full, well-tended body' . A full body? What on earth is that? Well-tended - what: like a pot-plant?

'Plump and pampered' (on the other hand) conjure up Stiva Oblonsky just perfectly - his sleekness, his self-indulgence, and love of good food, as well as his buoyancy, his class, even his good nature.

Connotation (in other words) - Rosemary Edmonds lets us take delight in connotation, while the new American translators seem to think it's a frivolous extra.

Dessaix sums up :

Rosemary Edmonds (it seems to me) has created a voice, while the new translation sounds to me as if there's no narrator there at all - just an excellent dictionary. (…) What I want as a reader of a translation from the Russian is to have an equivalent experience - given all the unbridgeable differences in time, culture, place and linguistic conventions - an equivalent experience to a Russian reader's. that is, I want to hear (in the case of a novel by Tolstoy) a confident, highly educated masculine voice narrating, not always elegantly but with an awareness of its own power, and a love of the world, and immense humanity, stories about all the things that matter to a European - love, death, marriage, family, God.
To hear that voice, I'm perfectly happy to sacrifice literal accuracy on all occasions - it's that voice I want to hear. I'm not so concerned about whether rabbits should be hares, or crimson should be scarlet or St John's wort should be liverwort. (...)
It's the whole that's important, rather than the reproduction of each individual note.

Dessaix concludes the programme :

I congratulate Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky on the accuracy of their translation - on the meticulousness of their rendering of each syllable of the Russian into English... but the voice I'd prefer to listen to in order to see what Russian readers see, is still Rosemary Edmonds. (Lingua Franca, 21 April 2001.)

That is the opinion of a fellow translator. So what about scholars and academics – how has the new translation scored with them?

In a review, dedicated to Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation of *Anna Karenina,* Catriona Kelly says that for Penguin Classics to commission a new translation was 'a brave and welcome initiative', yet the translation itself she calls 'a compendium of large and small disasters' (Kelly 2002, 287.)

Kelly starts the review by analysing the sentence that Pevear and Volokhonsky themselves cite as exemplary of their effects : '''And here's Mme Stahl,'' said Kitty, pointing to a bath-chair in which something lay, dressed in something grey and blue, propped on pillows under an umbrella.' Kelly shows that the translation of this sentence is neither faithful to Tolstoy's narration detail nor to his style :

Leaving aside the fact that we already know that this scene takes place on a bright, sunny morning, so that the 'umbrella' ought to be a 'parasol'[xviii], Tolstoy's humour would come out much more forcefully if more natural locutions were used, and the sentence structure of the original preserved : 'pointing to a bath-chair in which, propped up on pillows, wrapped in grey and blue, and shaded by a parasol, something or other was lying.' (Ibid. 284.)

Kelly admits that Pevear and Volokhonsky sometimes do 'hug' the phrasing of the original. Right at the start of the book Tolstoy's repetition of 'чувствовать' is preserved: 'This situation … was painfully *felt* by the couple themselves… They *felt* that that there was no sense in their living together.'

Yet Kelly points out that, only a page later, a much more important instance of repetition is elided: when Stiva 'finally saw (Dolly) in the bedroom with the *unfortunate* all-revealing note in her hand'. The translators (like their predecessors – M.B-H.) have failed to notice that the Russian word 'несчастная' is meant to echo the adjective in the famous opening sentence of the novel.

Kelly has discovered several departures from the original that do not seem to have reasonable explanations. Thus, 'he wrinkled his forehead' in chapter 1, part 1 'becomes he knitted his brows', 'she sprained her wrist' has become 'she dislocated her wrist' (part 3, chapter 2), 'fruit pie' becomes 'cake' (part 3, chapter 8). 'String baccy', *тютюн,* rough Ukrainian kind, turns into plain tobacco (part 3, chapter 8), 'milk agaric' (a type of wood mushroom) is translated as 'milk wort' (a flowering plant). More interestingly, 'консервы' are translated as tinned delicacies, which would be perfectly all right in case of a modern novel, but the OED gives 1889, thirteen years after *Anna Karenina* was completed, as the

first date for the appearance of 'to tin', in the sense of 'preserve food in sealed metal vessels'.

More importantly, in part 5, chapter 16, the translators render the word *девка* in an offensive and inaccurate way: 'slut'. As Kelly says, the whole point of Tolstoy's representation is to emphasise that this woman has preserved her dignity in adverse circumstances. (Ibid. 286)

If the translation is too stilted to satisfy the reader who knows nothing at all of the original language, Kelly also doubts that it is going to 'cut the mustard' with the academic Tolstoy specialists. After all, the translators do not even bother to specify which edition of the text they are translating from.

Kelly ultimately rejects Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation, claiming that 'it is not a beautiful translation (which perhaps it should not be); it is not even a faithful one' (Ibid. 287.) Speaking in terms of domestication and foreignization, it means that the translators who have chosen foreignizing fidelity to Tolstoy's style have neither domesticated their version enough to please a general reader nor have done enough research to move a more pedantic reader towards the author.

Another scholar of Russian literature, Rachel May, previously wrote about Pevear and Volokhonsky's translations of Dostoevsky :

> Pevear's inclination, like that of nearly all translators, is to view each word as Dostoevsky's careful choice, while for Bakhtin, the words also come from the characters. The Pevear and Volokhonsky translations (…) suffer from a mannered, even stilted quality of language that may be the result of excessive attention to the author's words, and too little to the characters' voices. (May 1994, 54.)

May's judgement implies that the translators' fidelity to the author's style can also result in 'the effacement of the superimposition of languages' (Berman). She explains that a translator who attaches validity to Bakhtin's ideas, would listen to the characters

themselves and show that, like the author, they too belong to a different language, age and culture.

2.11. Conclusion. If we look at different translations of *Anna Karenina* as chronologically successive stages on the road towards a Utopian perfect translation 'that looks as if it had been written by an English master of the novel without sacrificing the verbal accuracy that scholarship would demand', one can trace a certain continuity (at least with the five translations I am going to analyse at the next chapters): every translator wanted to be more faithful to the original than their predecessor. Garnett thought Dole's translation was so bad that it hardly gave any idea of the original; Maude pointed out that Garnett's translations were not free from mistakes. Edmonds wrote in a note on the 1978 revision: 'The correcting of mistakes which have crept into the text of a work of genius is a matter of the highest principle.'(Edmonds 1978, 8) Pevear and Volokhonsky's aim was to bring in as much as possible of Tolstoy's novel. Yet one can also see that fidelity to detail does not necessarily mean fidelity to the author's style. What the translator chooses to be faithful to depends on the existing translation standards but also on the translator's background: for instance, Garnett as a classicist and the wife of a writer was (probably subconsciously) more attentive to Tolstoy's style than Maude.

All the translators have followed translation fashions of their times. Dole's translation contains 'deliberately contrived foreignness' (Bassnett 1991, 71) due to the amount of Russian words he does not translate. Garnett translated the novel into fluent English, yet she did not believe in modernising, so a 1960s critic judged her translation as consisting of 'coy pet names, absurd endearments and stiff sentiments' underlining the novel's essential foreignness (Cohen 1962, 32-33). Maude and Garnett belonged to the same generation, but, apart from their personal circumstances (education, closeness to Tolstoy, etc.) their different translation styles could be explained by the fact that for Garnett (and her audience) in 1901 *Anna Karenina* was fairly modern and Tolstoy was still alive whilst for

Maude and his audience in 1918 and especially in the 1920s the Russia of Tolstoy's novels was 'a Russia of the past', as Galsworthy put it in his preface to the centenary edition of *Anna Karenina.* Edmonds and Carmichael translated for 'a reader in the train or on a holiday beach' (see above), therefore all traces of foreignness in their translations were reduced to a minimum. Translation fashions had changed by the time of Pevear's translation in that it had become normal to advocate taking the reader to the author, thus since the 1960s 'the pendulum has (…) swung the other way' (France 2000, 5). Also, as Knapp comments, there is currently a greater appreciation of certain elements of Tolstoy's prose that were found irksome by some of his contemporaries (Knapp 2003, 38).

CHAPTER 3: TRANSLATION OF CULTURE-SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE SOURCE TEXT

3.1. Introduction. This chapter discusses problems in translation arising from lack of equivalence between two natural languages and two cultural milieus and the ways in which five translators of *Anna Karenina* deal with those problems. The main point of analysis is whether translators 'retain every peculiarity of the original (…) with the greater care the more foreign it may be' (Cohen, see chapter 1) or try to make the source text more accessible for the target reader. Those problems are discussed both at word level and above word level. Five translations are compared for signs of source-language oriented and target-language oriented strategies.

Mona Baker describes the following strategies used by translators for dealing with various types of lexical non-equivalence :

a) translation by a more general word to overcome a lack of specificity in the target language compared to the source language;
b) translation by a more neutral / less expressive word;
c) translation by cultural substitution;
d) translation using a loan word or loan word plus explanation, used especially when the word in question is repeated several times in the text;
e) translation by paraphrase using a related word, used when the concept expressed by the source item is lexicalised in the target language but in a different form, and when the frequency with which a certain form is used in the source text is significantly higher than would be natural in the target language;

f) translation by paraphrase using unrelated words;

g) translation by omission;

h) translation by illustration, if the word which lacks an equivalent in the target language refers to a physical entity which can be illustrated. (Baker 1992, 26-42.)

In this list strategies d), e) and h) can be seen as more source language oriented, whilst the other strategies are more target language oriented. Below some of those strategies will be considered as they are used for dealing with particular types of non-equivalence in *Anna Karenina.*

A translation that is target-language oriented in respect of its vocabulary 1) tends not to use archaic words; 2) avoids culture specific words, such as those denoting national dishes like *уха* (fish soup)*, пирожки* (pasties), for example, replacing them with their dynamic equivalents (fish chowder, rolls) or omitting them; 3) converts words denoting measures into those used within the target culture: for example, when translating from languages that use metric systems into English, metres are replaced by feet, kilos by pounds, etc.

Source-language oriented translation uses archaic words: sometimes to reproduce the exact meaning of the word in the source text which is totally unknown in the target culture, sometimes to emphasise that the text belongs to a different age and culture. Some source-language words can be inserted in the text, usually accompanied by a footnote, or a phrase can be calqued, using the target language words in a way they are not normally used within the target language.

In source-language oriented translation words denoting measures used in the source culture are transliterated, transcribed or calqued.

3.2. Cultural Lacunas.

Culture-specific words denote physical objects and social realities, specific for a particular nation or country. They sound natural in the source language and therefore are especially difficult to translate. (Fyodorov 2002, 199.)

Davies describes the following strategies of translating culture-specific words:

1) preservation – maintaining the source text item in the translation. The initially foreign effect of the culture-specific word may dwindle as the item recurs throughout the text (the process of deforeignization);
2) addition – keeping the original item but supplementing the text with whatever information is judged necessary, either in the footnote or in the text ;
3) omission ;
4) globalization – replacing culture-specific references with ones that are more neutral or general, accessible to audiences from a wider range of cultural backgrounds;
5) localization – attempting to anchor a reference firmly in the culture of the target audience (Davies 2003, 72-86.)

Tolstoy, depicting Russian life with 'unparalelled reality' (Maude 1929, 428), uses culture-specific words frequently. In the table below several examples of culture-specific words and their translations in different versions of *Anna Karenina* are presented*:*

Tolstoy	Dole	Garnett	Maude	Edmonds	Pevear
Шафер [best man at a wedding]	*Shafer*	The best man	The best man	The best man	The best man
Камилавка [a special round velvet hat worn by Orthodox priests]	Calotte	Ecclesiastical cap	Sacerdotal headgear	Sacerdotal headgear	*Kamilavka* (with a footnote explanation)
Пирожки [patties, pasties]	Pasties	Pies	Pasties	Patties	*Pirozhki*
Староста [village headman, elder]	*Starosta* (bailiff)	Elder	Elder	Elder	Headman
Баба [peasant woman]	*Baba*	Wife	Woman	Woman	Woman
Щи [cabbage soup]	*Shchi* (cabbage soup)	Cabbage soup	Cabbage-soup	Cabbage-soup	*Shchi* (with a footnote explanation)
Каша [a thick gruel, made from	*Kasha* (wheat gruel)	Porridge	Buckwheat porridge	*Kasha*	*Kasha* (with a footnote explanation)

any grain]					
Калач [a white yeast bread, sometimes shaped like a purse with a handle]	*Kalatch*	Roll	Roll	Roll	*Kalatch* (with a footnote)
Шуба [fur-coat]	*Shuba*	Cloak	Coat	Coat	Coat
Уха [fish ,soup]	*Ukha*	Soup	Soup	Soup	Fish soup
Закуска [hors d'oeuvre]	*Zakuska*	Appetiser	Hors d'oeuvre	Appetizer	Hors d'oeuvre
Мужик [male peasant]	*Muzhik*	Peasant	Peasant	Peasant	*Muzhik*
Квас [Russian drink from brewed rye flour or bread with malt]	*Kvas*	Home-brew	*Kvas*	Home-brew	*Kvass* (with a footnote explanation)
Барыня	B*aruina*	Gentlewom	Mistress	Mistress	Lady

[mistress]		an			
Земство [elective provincial council for purposes of local administration]	*Zemstvo*	District council	*Zemstvo*	*Zemstvo* (with a footnote explanation)	*Zemstvo* (with a footnote explanation)
Т*елега* [cart]	T*elyega*	Trap	Cart	Trap	Gig
Приказчик [clerk]	*Prikashchik*	Clerk	Clerk	Clerk	Clerk
Извозчик [sledge-driver, cabby]	*Izvozshchik*	Sledge-driver	*Izvozchik*	Cabman	Cabby
Дача [country house]	*Datcha*	Summer villa	Country house (with a footnote explanation that it was customary for people who had an occupation	Summer villa	Country house

			in a Russian town in summer to take a country house near the town, where the family could live, while those members of it whose occupation was in town could go backwards and forwards)		

From this table one can see that Dole, Pevear and, less frequently, Maude tend to introduce words in their original Russian form (or to replace a Russian word with a French word like 'calotte'). As a rule, when Pevear introduces Russian words in his translation, he often tends to explain their meanings in the translator's notes. Garnett and Edmonds aim to find equivalents, sometimes replacing the realities of Russian life with the English ones. For instance, in Garnett's and Edmonds' translations *вексель* ('a promissory note') becomes 'IOU' (Garnett, 30, Edmonds, 39). However, if Garnett always attempts to

replace culture-specific words with English language items that are likely to have a similar impact on the target reader (translation by cultural substitution), Edmonds occasionally introduces Russian words like *zemstvo* in their original form with a footnote. Dole inserts Russian words in the text – sometimes even if they have obvious English equivalents, either explaining them in his glossary of Russian words and phrases at the end of the volume or directly in the text (translation using a loan word plus explanation). A couple of examples:

> '(...) несмотря на свою всегда разгульную жизнь, небольшие **чины** и нестарые годы, он занимал почетное и с хорошим жалованием место **начальника** в одном из московских присутствий.' [Gloss: in spite of his always dissipated life, small **ranks** and youngish years, he occupied a distinguished and good-salaried post as the **head** of one of the Moscow offices.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 22)
>
> 'Although he had always been gay, and took a low rank in the ***Tchin,*** and was still quite young, he nevertheless held an important salaried position as ***natchalnik*, or president** of one of the courts in Moscow.' (Dole, 19.)
>
> 'Скачки должны были происходить на большцом **четырехверстном** эллиптической формы кругу перед беседкой. На этом кругу были устроены девять препятствий: **река**, большой, в два **аршина**, глухой барьер перед самою беседкой (...) Но начинались скачки не с круга, а за сто **сажень** в стороне от него, и на этом расстоянии было первое препятствие - запруженная **река** в три **аршина** шириною, которую ездоки по произволу могли перепрыгивать или переезжать в брод.' [The races were to take place on a large four-**verst**, ellipse-shaped circle in front of the pavillion. On this circle nine obstacles were arranged: a **river**, a two-**arshin** large solid barrier in front of the pavillion itself (…) But the races started not from the circle but hundred **sazhens** to the side of it, and on that distance was the first obstacle – a dammed-up **river** three **arshins** wide, which the riders at their discretion could jump over or ride across.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 232)
>
> The race-course was a great ellipse of four ***versts,*** extending in front of the judges' stand, and nine obstacles intersected it; the ***reka*** **[river**]; a great barrier, two ***arshins*** **[4.66 feet**] high (…) The track did not begin in the circle itself, but about a hundred ***sazhens*** **(seven hundred feet**) to one side; and in this space was the first obstacle, the brimming ***reka,*** about three ***arshins*** **(seven feet**) in width, which they were free to leap or to ford. (Dole, 209)

The meanings of the Russian words occurring in Dole's translation are given in the glossary: *Tchin* – 'the order of official rank established by Peter the Great'; *natchalnik* -

'president'; *reka* - 'river', *sazhen* – '7 feet'; *arshin* – '21/3 feet'. The expression 'low rank in the *Tchin'* is tautological, since all it means is 'none-too-high rank'. The word *Tchin* is unnecessary but it russifies the text, emphasising that the narrative takes place in Russia, whereas the following word 'president' is, of course, an evidence of the translator's own American background. On the other hand, the three British translators sometimes use Britishisms, for instance, translating *пирожное* (cake, gateau) as 'pudding'.

By foreignizing vocabulary Dole attempts to maintain fidelity to the Russian language, 'allowing his language to be powerfully affected by the foreign tongue' (see chapter 1). His translation is so full of Russian words that it constantly emphasises the fact that the original text was written in Russian.

3.3. Words denoting measures. Preserving source-language units of measurement in translation usually makes the translated text sound foreign. Davies, for instance, shows that the preservation of 'inches' in the German translation of *Harry Porter* represents a case where something banal and everyday in the source culture becomes strange for the target audience. On the other hand, when, in the French translation, inches are converted into centimetres, the translation can come across as 'more meticulously detailed' than the original text. (Davies 2003, 74; 86.)

As seen from the examples above, Dole introduces Russian words denoting measures in his translation – presumably to offer the reader some flavour of the Russian language/culture. Those words are normally followed by their conversions into English measures, e.g. two *arshins* [4.66 feet], so that the reader could understand the sentence without having to look in the glossary. Some translators do not preserve Russian words denoting measures at all, replacing them with English measures. For example, in part 6, chapter 13 Levin returns from the hunt, 'исходив верст тридцать' [having walked for about thirty versts]. In Garnett's, Edmonds' and Pevear's translations he walks for twenty miles. (Garnett, 672); (Edmonds, 625), (Pevear, 595)

Dole and Maude keep the Russian term: 'tramped some thirsty versts' (Maude, v.2, 183), 'a run of thirty versts'. (Dole, 577)

Десятина and *сажень* remain *desyatin* and *sazhen* in Dole's translation, *desyatina* and *sazhen* in Maude's, ‘acre’ and ‘yard’ in Garnett's and Edmonds' translations, ‘cord’ and ‘*a*cre’ in Pevear's translation.

All the translators, apart from Dole, use English measures of weight:

> 'Ему не нужно было очень строго выдерживать себя, так как вес его равнялся положенным четырем **пудам** с половиною…' [He did not need to keep himself very strictly, since his weight equalled the required four and a half puds…] (Tolstoy, v.8, 207.)
>
> ‘He was not at all constrained to limit himself, since his weight satisfied the forty *pud* conditions of the service…’ (Dole, 187)
>
> ‘He had no need to be strict with himself, as he had very quickly been brought down to the **required little weight**…’ (Garnett, 197)[xix]
>
> ‘It was not necessary for him to train very strictly as his weight was just the regulation eleven-and-a-half **stone**…’ (Maude, v.1, 198.)
>
> ‘It was not necessary for him to train strictly, as his weight was just the regulation eleven and a half **stone**…’ (Edmonds, 192.)
>
> ‘He did not need to maintain himself too strictly, because his weight was exactly the regulation hundred and sixty **pounds**…’ (Pevear, 175.)

Exactly the same pattern can be observed with the measures of height:

> …его главный соперник, рыжий **пятивершковый** Гладиатор Махотина […his main rival, the ginger five-vershok tall Gladiator of Mahotin] (Tolstoy v.8, 214)
>
> …Makhotin’s Gladiator, - Vronsky’s most redoubtable rival, - a chestnut horse of five ***vershoks*** (Dole, 193)
>
> …his chief rival, Gladiator, a **very tall** chestnut horse (Garnett, 204)
>
> …his principal rival, Makhotin’s **sixteen-hand** chestnut, Gladiator (Maude v.1, 204-205.)
>
> …his chief rival, Mahotin’s **sixteen-hand** chestnut, Gladiator (Edmonds, 198.)
>
> …his main rival, Makhotin’s **sixteen-hand** chestnut, Gladiator (Pevear, 181.)

In the following sentence the measures of length are combined with money measures.

> '…на шесть кофточек нужно было двадцать четыре **аршина** наисуку по шестьдесят пять **копеек**, что составляло больше пятнадцати **рублей**…' […for six blouses one needed twenty-four **arshins** of nainsook at sixty-five **kopecks**, which made more than fifteen **roubles**…] (Tolstoy, v.9, 215.*)*

(Dole omits this sentence)

> '… for six dressing-jackets there would be needed twenty-four **yards** of nainsook at **sixteenpence the yard,** which was a matter of thirty **shillings**…' (Garnett, 696)

> '… six jackets required twenty-four ***arshins*** of nainsook at sixty-five **kopeks**, which comes to more than fifteen **roubles**…' (Maude, v.2, 207)

> '…six jackets took over eighteen **yards** of nainsook at one-and-three a **yard**, which was a matter of thirty **shillings**…' (Edmonds, 648)

> '…for sixty chemises she needed seventeen **yards** of nainsook at ninety **kopecks a yard**, which would come to over fifteen **roubles**…' (Pevear, 617)

In this case a translator can choose between using both English measures of length and monetary units (Garnett and Edmonds), using both Russian measures of length and monetary units (Maude) or using one English measure and one Russian measure (Pevear). It may be useful to try and analyse which words referring to measures translators choose to replace with target-language terms and which ones to preserve in their source-language forms. As shown above, most English language translators convert Vronsky's weight into pounds/stones and the horse's height into hands (Garnett omits both measures, replacing them by 'little weight' or 'very tall'). One possible explanation is that, as a rule, translators use source-language words to signal the cultural differences of the text, whereas Vronsky's weight is a part of the physical portrait of one of the central characters in the book and therefore, translators may feel, it should be expressed in parametres that are

easily accessible to the target audience. Gladiator's height is important because Tolstoy contrasts a very tall horse with a smaller Frou-Frou. Generally, when readers approach a novel that belongs to a different culture, they presumably expect to encounter a different monetary system, different measurements of land, etc., but are more likely to want to identify with the novel's characters, their heights, weights, etc.

Since the system of educational grades in Russia is different from the ones in Britain and the United States, when translating the following Levin's thought 'Так же краснел и вздрагивал я, считая все погибшим, когда получил **единицу** за физику и остался на втором курсе…' [In the same way I blushed and trembled when I got **a 'one'** in physics and stayed in the second year] (Tolstoy, v.8, 179), translators could either preserve the Russian grade (one) or substitute it with an equivalent British/American grade. In reality, they all choose to paraphrase the sentence to compensate for a lack in cultural equivalence. Dole and Garnett translate this sentence using 19th century public school term 'to pluck' ('when I was plucked in physics and did not get my remove'), Maude and Edmonds use a British slang verb 'to plough' ('ploughed in physics'). It is likely that the expression 'plucked in physics' was widely used within the class Garnett belonged to. Therefore it was meant to have a familiar effect on her target audience (i.e. her contemporaries), but nowadays the expression sounds archaic and its meaning is unclear to the modern reader of Garnett's translation. Pevear, too, paraphrases this sentence, but his translation is more fluent, yet at the same time its register is closer to the register of Tolstoy's original:

'I blushed and shuddered in the same way, thinking all was lost, when I got **the lowest grade** in physics and had to repeat my second year…'(Pevear, 151.)

The example above demonstrates that, contrary to Venuti's suggestion that a domesticating translation is normally written in a language that is modern instead of archaic, that is widely used instead of specialised and standard instead of colloquial (Venuti 1995, 4-5), a translation can also depart from the source text by being more

archaic than the source text. For instance, as Chukovsky shows, Konstantin Balmont domesticated his translations of Shelley, using his own Balmontian language. Where Shelley has ‘sleep’, Balmont translates it as ‘voluptuous bliss’, where Shelley has ‘woman’, Balmont translates ‘a woman pretty as a picture’. (Leighton 1984, 21.) Even more so, Chukovsky points out, Balmont tries in every way to ‘correct’ the American poet Walt Whitman : ‘under no circumstances … does Balmont permit Whitman to speak in an ordinary language, and he persistently replaces Whitman’s simple words with ‘‘noble’’, archaic Church Slavonicisms.’ (Ibid. 23.) Here the balance between the source text and the target text possibly becomes more complex: not the simple choice between bringing the reader to the author or the author to the reader, as Schleiermacher had put it (see Lefevere 1992, 149), but the relationship between the source text reader and the target text reader, between the author and the translator. Using Nabokov’s words, instead of dressing up like the real author, the translator ‘dresses up the author as himself’ (Nabokov 1981, 319), therefore this is not so much about bringing the author to the reader but rather bringing the author to the translator. Balmont brings the poets he translates not to the general Russian reader but to the reader who is accustomed to Balmont’s own style. Obviously in this case a source-text oriented translation (i.e. bringing the reader to the author) would consist of a plainer modern vocabulary, more like Whitman’s English. Pevear’s translation of the sentence above is, too, more source-text oriented than the other translations. By following the register of Tolstoy’s original he achieves greater proximity to Tolstoy’s style.

The choice between domestication and foreignization becomes even more difficult when words denoting measures appear in dialogues: on one hand, in order that the reader of a translated text could believe in the existence of a character created by the original author, that character has communicate with other characters fluently, on the other hand, as Berman wrote, domestication could also result in the absurdity where American characters express themselves through a network of French images (Berman 2000, 295.).

In part 2, chapter 35, the old prince Shcherbatsky says:

> 'Другое время такое, что целый месяц за **полтинник** отдашь, а то так никаких денег за полчаса не возьмешь.' [Another time is such that one will give away a whole month for fifty kopecks, and sometimes one will take no money for half an hour.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 276)

In Garnett's translation the prince says:

> 'Why, there's time one would give a month of for **sixpence**, and time you wouldn't give half an hour of for any money.' (Garnett, 263-264.)

'Полтинник' (a fifty kopecks coin) has therefore become a sixpence. Maude's and Edmonds' translations are equally anglicising:

> 'There are times when one would give a whole month for a **shilling** and there are times when you would not give half an hour at any price.' (Maude, v.1, 264)
>
> 'There are times when one would give a whole month for **sixpence** and others when you wouldn't sell half-an-hour at any price.' (Edmonds, 253)

Compare those with Dole's translation:

> 'There are whole months that you would sell for **fifty *kopeks***, and quarter-hours that you would not take any amount of money for.' (Dole, 247-248.)

Pevear also preserves 'fifty kopecks' in his translation:

> 'There are times when you'd give a whole month away for **fifty kopecks**, and others when you wouldn't give up half an hour for any price.' (Pevear, 234)

The prince's words actually sound more natural in the translations by Dole and Pevear than in the other three translations, even though the prince talks about the kopecks rather than shillings and sixpence. Garnett, Maude and Edmonds strive to make the text more accessible for English readers, which results in an absurdity

when they make the Russian prince, entertaining other Russians in Germany, suddenly speak of shillings and sixpence!

In the same conversation the prince uses a simile to talk about his dislike of Germans:

> 'Все они довольны, как медные **гроши** (…)' [They are all content like copper half a kopeck coins (…)] (Tolstoy, v.8, 276.)

Dole foreignizes and domesticates this sentence at the same time by naming an English coin but also transliterating the Russian word in the brackets:

> 'They are as contented as new **shillings [lit. *groshi,* twenty kopeks**]. (Dole, 247)

Garnett and Maude replace the Russian 'гроши' with English coins:

> 'They're all as pleased as brass **halfpence**.' (Garnett, 263)
>
> 'They are as self-satisfied as brass **farthings** (…)' (Maude, v.1, 264.)

But the simile does not work in English as well as it does in Russian, so Edmonds omits it altogether:

> 'They are so mighty self-satisfied.' (Edmonds, 253)

Pevear replaces the Russian image of a shiny coin with a truly English simile:

> 'They're all pleased as **Punch** (…)' (Pevear, 233.)

However well this dynamic equivalence works, Pevear makes the Russian prince with his dislike of everything foreign use an English image – this is exactly what Berman defined as 'ethnocentrism' (Berman 2000, 295.) It suggests being faithful to the target audience to the extent where almost everything foreign and exotic becomes standardised.

3.4. Non-equivalence of Semantic Fields in the SL and the TL. Even when a particular source language word has a target language equivalent, there may be a

difference in the frequency with which it is used or its pragmatic characteristics or semantic range. In a target-text oriented translation less frequent equivalents are replaced with more frequently used words, even if their meanings are further away from the meanings of the words in the source text. Source-text oriented translations preserve the more exact equivalents, even if they are rarely used in the target language.

For instance, decribing the word *душа* as one of the leitmotifs of Russian literature, Wierzbicka comments on how the high frequency and the wide scope of the Russian *душа* distinguish it from the English ‘soul’ – according to word counts, there are 6 times more occurrences of *душа* in the Russian corpus than there are occurrences of ‘soul’ in the English corpus. Tolstoy has been frequently called a master of ‘the dialectics of soul’, and he often used the word *душа* when describing his characters’ inner struggle of contradictory feelings (see Opulskaia 1961, 316). In English translations of Russian novels *душа* is sometimes translated as ‘soul’, but in most cases it is either omitted or replaced with either ‘heart’ or ‘mind’. Wierzbicka quotes several examples from the Maude translation of *War and Peace* where *душа* has been rendered as ‘soul’, often producing 'rather bizarre English sentences', such as:

'A strange feeling of exasperation and yet of respect for this man's self-possession mingled at that moment in Rostov's soul.'

‘‘It can’t be helped! It happens to everyone!’ – said the son with a bold, free and easy tone, while in his soul he regarded himself as a worthless scoundrel whose whole life could not atone for his crime.’ (Wierzbicka 1992, 33)

Those 'rather bizarre English sentences' are clear-cut examples of source-text oriented translation. The second sentence is probably less ‘bizarre’ because of the word ‘atone’ that brings in a religious connotation and therefore justifies the use of the word ‘soul’: soul refers to an entity which both has a religious and a psychological dimension.

Below translations of several sentences, containing the word *душа* in *Anna Karenina* will be examined.

1) 'Он **в душе** своей не уважал матери и, не отдавая себе в том отчета, не любил ее, хотя, по понятиям того круга, в котором жил, по воспитанию своему, не мог себе представить других к матери отношений, как в высшей степени покорных и почтительных, и тем более внешне покорных и почтительных, чем менее **в душе** он уважал и любил ее.' [He **in his soul** did not respect mother and, not acknowledging it to himself, did not love her, although, according to the ideas of the circle in which he lived, to his upbringing, could not imagine any other relationships to mother, apart from the obedient and deferential in the highest degree, and the more outwardly obedient and deferential, the less **in his soul** he respected and loved her.] (Tolstoy, v. 8, 76)

Without ever having confessed as much to himself, he had no great respect for his mother, and he did not love her. But his education and the usages of the society in which he lived did not allow him to admit that there could be in his relations with her the slightest want of consideration. But the more he exaggerated the bare outside forms, the more he felt **in his heart** that he did not respect or love her. (Dole, 69)

He did not **in his heart** respect his mother, and without acknowledging it to himself, he did not love her, though in accordance with the ideas of the set in which he lived, and with his own education, he could not have conceived of any behaviour to his mother not in the highest degree respectful and obedient, and the more externally obedient and respectful his behaviour, the less **in his heart** he respected and loved her. (Garnett, 68)

In the depths of his heart he did not respect his mother and (though this he never acknowledged to himself) did not love her, but in accordance with the views of the set he lived in, and as a result of his education, he could not imagine himself treating her in any way but one altogether submissive and respectful, and the more submissive and respectful he was externally, the less he honoured and loved her **in his heart**. (Maude, v.1, 68)

In the depths of his heart he had no great respect for his mother and, though not confessing as much to himself, did not love her; but in accordance with the ideas of his set and with his upbringing, he could not imagine treating her otherwise than dutifully and with the greatest respect, and the more outwardly dutiful and respectful he was, the less he respected and loved her **in his heart**. (Edmonds, 74)

In his soul he did not respect her and, without being aware of it, did not love her, though by the notions of the circle in which he lived, by his upbringing, he could not imagine to himself any other relation to his mother than one obedient and deferential in the highest degree, and the more outwardly obedient and deferential he was, the less he respected and loved her **in his soul**. (Pevear, 61)

In these sentences only Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation renders *душа* as ‘soul’, whilst the other translators replace it with ‘heart’ or ‘the depths of his heart’. Dole paraphrases the first occurrence of ‘в душе’ and translates the second one as ‘in his heart’. In English feelings are always linked with a person’s heart, but in Russian they are linked either with a person’s *сердце* [heart] or with a person's *душа* (Wierzbicka 1992, 48.) If Garnett's translation of this sentence were to be translated back into Russian, then the word 'heart' would have to be changed again for *душа*: in Russian the heart can be associated with love but not with respect.

> 2) 'Она знала, что теперь, с отъездом Долли, никто уже не растревожит в ее **душе** те чувства, которые поднялись в ней при этом свидании. Тревожить эти чувства ей было больно; но она все-таки знала, что это была самая лучшая часть ее **души** и что эта часть ее **души** быстро зарастала в той жизни, которую она вела.' [She knew that now, with Dolly’s departure, no one would stir **in her soul** those feelings that had risen in it during that visit. It was painful for her to disturb these feelings; but still she knew that it was the very best part of her **soul** and that this part of her **soul** was quickly overgrowing in that life she was leading.] (Tolstoy, v.9, 245).
>
> She knew that no one would waken in her the feelings which Dolly had aroused in her **soul**, and which represented all the better side of her **nature**. Soon all **vestige of such feelings** would be stifled by the life that she was leading. (Dole, 615)
>
> She knew that now, from Dolly's departure, no one again would stir up within her **soul** the feelings that had been roused by their conversation. It hurt her to stir up these feelings, but yet she knew that that was the best part of her **soul,** and than that part of her **soul** would quickly be smothered in the life she was leading. (Garnett, 724)
>
> She knew that when Dolly was gone no one would call up in her **soul** the feelings which had been aroused by their meeting. To have those feelings awakened was painful, but still she knew that they were the best part of her **soul**, and that that part of **her** was rapidly being choked by the life she was leading. (Maude, v.2, 236)
>
> She knew that with Dolly’s departure the feelings the visit had roused in **her** would never be stirred again. To have those feelings awakened was painful but yet she knew that they belonged to the better part of **herself**, **which** was fast becoming smothered by the life she was leading. (Edmonds, 673.)
>
> She knew that now, with Dolly’s departure there would be no one to stir in her **soul** those feelings that had been aroused in her at this meeting. To stir

> up those feelings was painful for her; but she knew all the same that that was the best part of her **soul** and that **it** was quickly overgrown in the life she led. (Pevear, 642.)

Dole, Garnett and Maude, who have used 'heart' in the previous example, use 'soul' to translate this paragraph. This particular meaning of the word 'soul' is described by Wierzbicka as ''a substratum of hidden psychological processes, unknowable to outsiders, and not necessarily clear to the 'insider''. She points out that this sense of the word 'soul' occurs more in translations – not only from Russian, but also from French and German – than in original English discourse (Wierzbicka 1992, 38.) No translator uses the word 'heart' to translate this paragraph – probably because the heart is not normally seen as a seat of conflicting emotions. In other words, feelings and emotions can not belong to one part of the heart: such expressions as 'change of heart' and 'to have one's heart in' indicate that the heart is normally dominated by one feeling, emotion or passion. Moreover, the expression 'with half a heart' indicates the lack of feeling on someone's part. The soul is 'larger' than the heart as it is seen as the whole of the person without the body. In the folk philosophy reflected in the word 'soul' a person has two parts: one which can be seen (the body) and one which cannot be seen (the soul). It is therefore possible for conflicting psychological processes to coexist in one's soul – and there are no expressions like '* with half a soul' or '* change of soul', since the soul is not expected to be dominated by one emotion. The feelings and emotions that Dolly's visit has stirred in Anna are rather mixed, and she knows that they belong to the best part of her soul (the seat of her moral beliefs and judgements), even though she does not give herself to those feelings wholeheartedly[xx].

Only Garnett preserves the word 'soul' in this paragraph three times to match the three occurrences of 'душа' in Tolstoy's text; Maude uses it twice, Dole – once, and Edmonds omits it altogether.

3) 'Та привязанность, которую он испытывал к Анне, исключила в его **душе** последние потребности **сердечных** отношений к людям.' [That attachment which he felt for Anna, excluded in his **soul** the last need of **heartfelt** relationships with people.] (Tolstoy, v.9, 89)

'This attachment prevented him from feeling the need of any other **intimacy**.' (Dole, 510)

'The attachment he felt for Anna precluded in his **heart** every need of **intimate** relations with others.' (Garnett, 574)

'His attachment to Anna excluded from his **soul** any need he had felt for **affectionate** relations with other people…' (Maude, v.2, 82)

'His attachment to Anna took away the last need he might have felt for any other **intimacy**.' (Edmonds, 535)

'The attachment he experienced for Anna excluded from his **soul** the last need for **heartfelt** relations with people.' (Pevear, 507)

In this sentence Tolstoy uses both ‘душа' and ‘сердечный’ - heartfelt. Out of the five translators only Pevear uses the exact English equivalents of both words, with Dole and Edmonds omitting ‘душа’, Garnett replacing it with ‘heart’ and all the translators, with the exception of Pevear, replacing ‘heartfelt relations’ with ‘intimate’ or ‘affectionate’ relations. Pevear's translation is also the most literal because he renders ‘последние потребности' as ‘the last need’ rather than 'the need' or 'any need', which sound more natural in English.

In the examples above the word *душа* meant an organ of deep emotions. The translator is confronted with an even more difficult choice when Tolstoy mentions some vague thought in Anna's soul:

4) '(…) много других мыслей о том, что будет теперь, после разрыва, приходили ей в голову, но она не всею **душою** отдавалась этим мыслям. В **душе** ее была какая-то неясная мысль, которая одна интересовала ее, но она не могла ее сознать. (…) И она вдруг поняла то, что было в ее **душе**.' [(...) many other thoughts about what would happen now, after the rupture, came into her head, but she did not give herself to these thoughts with all her **soul**. In her **soul** there was some unclear thought which alone interested her, but she could not realise it. (...) And she suddenly understood what was in her **soul**.] (Tolstoy v.9, 361-*36*2)

> 'The most contradictory thoughts crowded upon her. (...) A vague idea came into her **mind**, and awakened some interest, but she could not express it.' (Dole, 701.)

> '(...) many other ideas of what would happen now after the rupture, came into her head ; but she did not give herself up to them with all her **heart**. **At the bottom of her heart** was some obscure idea that alone interested her, but she could not get clear sight of it. (…) And all at once she knew what was in her **soul**.' (Garnett, 838.)

> '(...) many other thoughts about what would happen now after the rupture, passed through her mind, but she did not give herself up **entirely** to these thoughts. In her **soul** there was another vague idea, which alone interested her, but of which she could not get hold. (…) And suddenly she understood what was in her **soul**.' (Maude, v.2, 353.)

> '(...) many other speculations as to what would happen after the rupture, passed through her mind ; but there was something else. A dim thought was lurking somewhere at **the back of her brain**, which was the only one that mattered but which she could not get hold of. (…) And all at once she knew what was at **the back of her mind**.' (Edmonds, 777)

> '(...) many other thoughts of what would happen now, after the break-up, came to her mind, but she did not give herself **wholeheartedly** to these thoughts. In her **soul** there was some vague thought which alone interested her, yet she was unable to bring it to consciousness. (…) And she suddenly understood what was in her **soul**.' (Pevear, 745.)

The first mention of *душа* in this paragraph refers to the whole of Anna's being and is paraphrased by all the translators: 'did not give herself up with all her heart', 'did not give herself up entirely', 'did not give herself wholeheartedly'; Edmonds changes the sentence totally, replacing the clause with 'but there was something else'. In the second and the third sentences of this paragraph the soul again is seen as a substratum of hidden psychological processes, unclear to Anna herself. Presumably most translators realise the awkwardness of the sentence 'in her soul there was some thought', yet the Maudes and Pevear choose to use the closest equivalent to the word Tolstoy uses even if the resulting English sentence is awkward. Edmonds, on the other hand, anglicises the text, placing the thought either at the back of Anna's brain or at the back of her mind.

In the following chapters we will see that Edmonds frequently modernises Tolstoy's text. Substituting *душа* for 'mind' or 'brain' in two consecutive sentences is both anglicising and modernising. As Wierzbicka says, the victory of *mind* over *soul*

proves decline of religiosity, the birth of a new kind of dualism in English ways of thinking, a dualism reflecting the supreme value placed in modern Anglo-Saxon culture on rational thinking and knowing. In other words, a human being used to be thought of as composed of a body and a soul and has now come to be thought as composed instead of a body and an intellect (Wierzbicka 1992, 46.) Substituting *душа* for 'mind' or 'brain' is wrong in this particular paragraph where Tolstoy shows a dichotomy between the heroine's mind ('голова') where there were many thoughts and her soul ('душа') where there was only one thought of death that alone interested Anna and led her to suicide. To compensate, Edmonds adds the word 'lurking' to make the thought more obscure and less rational. Garnett preserves the dichotomy between *голова* and *душа* as the contrast between Anna's head and heart and eventually chooses 'soul' in the last sentence as an internal theatre of psychological feelings.

One can therefore see that *душа* is sometimes translated as 'soul', but in most cases it is either omitted or replaced with either 'heart' or 'mind'. That happens because the semantic range of the word *душа* is different from the semantic range of 'soul'. Substituting *душа* for 'brain' is both anglicising and modernising and reflects the decline of religiosity in modern English culture. Choosing 'soul' to translate *душа* occasionally results in awkward English sentences, which are more 'literal' translations of the Russian text.

3.5. <u>Names.</u> Names can be either transliterated or translated into the target language (Fyodorov 2002, 215). Transliterating names can make the text difficult for the target audience – difficult to distinguish between two similarly sounding names or even to know that Anna Karenina's husband was called Karenin, not Karenina, and also difficult to relate to the characters whose names one cannot pronounce properly. Translating names, on the other hand, causes problems, too: names are even less likely to have close equivalents in the target language than other source language words; the meanings

encoded in names can provide a guide to subconscious attitudes within a culture that do not easily translate into another culture. Besides, the change of names prevents the reader from getting to know the source culture.

Unlike British people, Russians do not normally address each other formally by the family name but by Christian name and patronymic. Lyons (1979, 247) points out that when, in part 4, chapter 9, Levin, addressing Karenin, hesitates because he has forgotten his name it is not *Karenin* that he has forgotten. It is not possible for Levin to address Karenin, in the circumstances, other than by first name and patronymic. Lyons suggests that in French the equivalent form of address would be *Monsieur* and in English *Karenin.* This, too, could create a problem for Tolstoy's English translator. Oblonsky sometimes addresses Levin as *Kostya* and sometimes as Levin; at the train station Vronsky addresses Oblonsky by his family name – this is acceptable between males because they are close friends. At the same time, when Oblonsky speaks to Karenin, he always addresses him formally by his first name and patronymic – even though they are brothers-in-law, the relationship between them is rather formal. Making Levin address Karenin in English by his last name would therefore remove the contrast between two different forms of address, one signifying formality and the other one familiarity.

There are two obvious directions in which English translators tend to assimilate Russian names. Firstly, translators can use the male form of a woman's surname, since the feminine form is not usual in English. This anglicising strategy has been criticised by Emerson for producing 'the gender hybrids that spring to some of our minds when we see "Mrs. Kalmykov" or "Katerina Osipovna Khokhlakov"' (Emerson 1991, 310.) Secondly, English translators can be inclined to simplify the great variety of names and forms of address in Russian, replacing the combination of Christian name and patronymic by the surname or another form of address wherever possible – for the sake of clarity and fluency. The first names tend to be anglicised, too: e.g. Constantine for Konstantin,

Nicholas for Nikolai, etc. Names of places and streets are translated, e.g. 'Mashka's Heights', 'Mashka's Upland', etc.

In a source-text oriented translation all these forms are preserved intact, i.e. transliterated rather than translated.

Translators have been alternating between two forms of the name of the main heroine: 'Anna Karenina' in Dole's translation, 'Anna Karenin' (Garnett), 'Anna Karenina' (Maude), 'Anna Karenin' (Edmonds) and 'Anna Karenina' (Pevear).

Pevear and Volokhonsky use the masculine form of family names with the exception of 'Karenina' – presumably because of how the title of the book has been acculturated and is traditionally known to the majority of readers. Dole was the first one to translate it, and the title of his 1886 translation was *Anna Karenina.*

Maude and Edmonds in their translations choose to replace the combination of Christian name and patronymic by the surname or another form of address wherever possible – for the sake of clarity and fluency. For example, when Koznyshev is about to propose to Varenka, he intends to address her as 'Варвара Андреевна' [Varvara Andreevna]. Maude and Edmonds change the address to 'Mademoiselle Varenka' (Maude, v.2, 147, Edmonds, 593) – presumably so that not to overload readers with unnecessary information.[xxi] The other translators keep the name and patronymic intact. Similarly, when Oblonsky comes to visit Dolly in Pokrovskoye, he greets her as 'Долленька' – a diminutive of Dolly, which makes Levin suspect Oblonsky's insincerity. This 'Долленька' becomes 'Dolly' in Garnett's translation and 'Dolly dear' in the Maude translation and in Edmonds' translations. During the hunt Levin addresses his dog as 'Ласочка', translated by Dole as 'Lasotchka', 'Lasochka' by Pevear; Laska by Garnett and Edmonds; and 'Laska dear' by Maude. Maude therefore uses the word 'dear' to convey the meaning of endearment expressed by Russian suffixes *–еньк* and *–очк.* Only once does Levin mention his brother Nikolai after the latter's death and calls him 'Николенька' (Tolstoy, v.9, 149) – which reveals to Kitty and to the Russian readers how much Levin misses his beloved

late brother. The form ‘Nikolenka’ is preserved only in Pevear’s translation, with Garnett and Edmonds using ‘Nikolai’ and the Maudes using ‘Nicholas’. Yet, in essence Levin compares his two brothers, emphasising how much closer he was to Nikolenka than he is to Sergei, and this emphasis is lost in translation, if the translator makes Levin use Nikolai’s full name. The old Prince Shcherbatsky calls his daughters ‘Катенька' [Katenka] and ‘Дашенька' [Dashenka], having no use of the 'new-fangled English diminutives'[xxii] (part 1, chapter 15.) In Garnett's, the Maude and Edmonds' translations the old Prince still refers to them as Kitty and Dolly, and his dislike of everything non-Russian, so well described by Tolstoy in part 2, chapter 34, is not conveyed in those translations. Levin's brother Nikolai also refers to Kitty as 'твоя Катя' [your Katya], which pleases Levin: '…Катя, как ее называл брат Николай и как теперь Левину было особенно приятно называть ее…' In this context, when the translator has to change Kitty’s name, the Maudes call her Kate:

‘‘… Kitty – or ‘Kate’ as Nicholas called her, and as Levin was also fond of calling her now…’’ (Maude, v.2, 69) ‘Kate’ is the closest English equivalent of *Катя*, yet there is a subtle difference. As Wierzbicka (1992, 242-245) points out, the soft consonant t’ in the name *Катя* suggests a shade of semantic ‘softness’, the element ‘I feel something good towards you’, whereas the English ‘Kate’ is more neutral and does not have this semantic element of affection. Perhaps even more important is the Russian characteristic of «Катя»: as Liza Knapp comments, Kitty becomes the matriarch of the Levin family, and it is therefore fitting that she has been given a new and Russian name by a dying member of the family (Knapp 2003, 18).

Maude anglicises other characters’ names, too – calling Levin ‘Constantine’, Marya Nikolayevna – ‘Mary Nikolayevna’, Stepan Arkadyevich – ‘Stephen Arkadyevich’, Nikolai – ‘Nicholas’, Matvei – ‘Matthew’, etc. In Part 2, where Oblonsky is visiting Levin in the country, he addresses Levin as ‘Костя' – Maudes makes Oblonsky address Levin as ‘Constantine’. (Maude, 182)

Dole normally keeps the Russian forms of the characters' names in Tolstoy's text but occasionally he 'loses' their patronymics – referring to Karenin as 'Aleksei' (Dole, 521) or Oblonsky as 'Stepan' (Dole, 272) – something no one else, including Tolstoy, calls them.

With the exception of 'Karenina', Pevear only uses the masculine form of family names. Pevear reverses Edmonds' practice of replacing first names with family names. At Levin's wedding Tolstoy refers to Kitty's middle sister as 'Львова', whereas Pevear calls her Natalie – as he uses the masculine form of family names, Lvov would be impossible and Mme Lvov (or Princess Lvov) would be too formal.

Wierzbicka, showing the semantic meaning of the expressive derivation of names in the Russian language, quotes an example in Part 8, chapter 11 of *Anna Karenina:* two types of people are contrasted, those who live for the belly and those who live for the soul. Tolstoy's attitude towards these two types is epitomised in the contrast between the disrespectful form 'Mitjuxa' (with a pejorative suffix *yx)* and the affectionate and respectful 'Fokanyc', a contracted form of the patronymic (Wierzbicka 1992, 408.): '**Митюха**, только брюхо набивает, а **Фоканыч** – правдивый старик.'

Maude turns 'дядя Фоканыч' (whose first name was *Платон*) into 'Daddy Plato', making the text more accessible for the English speaking readers: 'But if Daddy Plato would ever skin a man!.. One man lives only for his own needs: take **Mityuka**, who only stuffs his own belly, but **Plato** is an upright old man.' (Maude, v.2, 411) The other translators keep the Russian forms of the names:

> 'One lives for his belly, like **Mitiukh**; but **Fokanuich**, - he's an honest man, - he lives for his soul.' (Dole, 749)
>
> 'One man lives for his own wants and nothing else, like **Mituh**; he only thinks of filling his belly, but **Fokanitch** is a righteous man.' (Garnett, 893)
>
> 'One man lives for his own wants and nothing else – take **Mityuka**, who only thinks of stuffing his belly – but **Fokanich** is an upright old man. (Edmonds, 829)

> ‘One man just lives for his own needs, take **Mityukha** even, just stuffs his belly, but **Fokanych** – he’s an upright old man.’ (Pevear, 794)

On the whole, Maude and Edmonds change Russian names more than other translators. They use different techniques of assimilation: Maude anglicises Russian names but keeps the feminine forms of the surnames which, using Emerson’s terminology, creates strange culture hybrids: Mary Nikolayevna, Stephen Arkadyevich, Sergius Ivanich, etc. Edmonds preserves Russian names but only uses the male form of the Russian surnames. This strategy can also prevent the target readers from appreciating certain effects of the source text. An example:

When Vronsky meets Oblonsky at the train station, Oblonsky tells him he is expecting his sister Anna.

> ‘-Ах, это Каренину? – сказал Вронский.
> - Ты ее, верно, знаешь?
> - Кажется, знаю. Или нет... Право, не помню, - рассеянно отвечал Вронский, смутно представляя себе при имени Карениной что-то чопорное и скучное.’ [-Ah, it is Karenina? – said Vronsky.
> - You must know her, do you?
> - It seems to me, I do. Or not… Really, I don’t remember, - replied Vronsky absent-mindedly, vaguely imagining at the name Karenina something formal and dull.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 74)

In Garnett’s and Edmonds’s translations, where only the male form of the surname is used, Vronsky imagines something stiff and tedious at the name Karenin, not Karenina. That can be read as if he was imagining a stiff and tedious husband rather than a stiff and tedious Anna Karenina who is so wonderfully contrasted with the tender and lively lady he meets only a few minutes later. Vronsky could, of course, expect dullness from both the wife and the husband. As Tolstoy writes in part 1, chapter 34, Vronsky despised all those vulgar, stupid and ridiculous people who belived that one husband had to live with one wife, that one had to bring up children, earn money, pay one’s debts, etc. When he first met Karenin, he was insulted and disgusted. It is, however, important for the narrative that

the stiff and dull Anna Karenina of Vronsky's imagination turned out to be lively and anything but dull and so different from her husband.

To sum up, all the translators assimilate Russian names to a certain extent: by anglicising names, by only using male forms of surnames, by omitting patronymics or by replacing a combination of a name and a patronymic with a surname. The Maudes and Edmonds assimilate Russian names more than the other translators; Dole's and Pevear's translations of Russian names are more source-text oriented than those of the other translators. Anglicising names causes destruction of vernacular networks of the Russian text (Berman, see chapter 1).

3.6. Translating Personal Pronouns. Translation of personal pronouns from Russian into English frequently involves loss of information in respect of the degree of intimacy between participants, as the Russian *ты* (familiar pronoun of address) and *вы* (formal pronoun of address) are both normally translated as 'you'. Lyons (1980, 240-243) comments on the importance of understanding the use of pronouns of address in *Anna Karenina.* In a detailed account of Russian pronominal usage in the 19th century, which gives all the necessary background information, Friedrich (1966, 216) points out that Tolstoy 'was abnormally aware of the pronominal symbolism of social differences'. Whenever the characters are speaking French, they address each other as *vous (вы).* The use of *ты* therefore is a sure indication that the characters are speaking Russian rather than French. When speaking Russian, husbands and wives normally say *ты* to each other. Anna says *ты* to Vronsky when their affair begins, but Marya Nikolayevna says *вы* to Nikolai Levin – mainly because of their inequality in the society. Oblonsky, because of his friendly gregarious nature, says *ты* to most of his friends. The same people, who say *ты* to each other in Russian, normally change to *вы* when speaking French. The use of *вы,* however, does not necessarily mean that the conversation is in French, as characters like

Anna and Vronsky or Anna and Karenin or Dolly and Stiva sometimes switch to *вы* in Russian in the course of a quarrel or estrangement.

Those cases where the narrator comments on whether the characters are using *вы* or *ты* in order to reveal the nature of the relationship between them can be especially difficult for translators.

In those situations a target language oriented strategy will be either to omit such comments or to replace the pronouns with equivalent forms expressing formality/informality in English, for example, a formal address vs. first name, or to use compensatory strategies.

In a source language oriented translation pronouns *вы* and *ты* can be transliterated in the target text, usually with an explanation footnote, *ты* can be translated as thou*,* or the pronouns can be described in the text as Russian formal/intimate forms.

Analysing the conversation between Karenin and Oblonsky in part 7, chapter 17, Lyons comments that Oblonsky has come to see Karenin on two unrelated matters: to get Karenin's support in his attempt to procure a very lucrative position for himself and to persuade Karenin to give Anna a divorce. There are two reasons for Karenin and Oblonsky to say *ты* to each other: as high-ranking civil servants of the same social standing and as brothers-in-law. During the first part of the conversation they are enacting the former role, and Karenin is comfortable enough saying *ты.* As soon as Oblonsky adopts the role of brother-in-law, Karenin switches to *вы* because he wants to show Oblonsky that the family relationships that once existed between them do not exist any longer.
Tolstoy occasionally uses these changes between *ты* and *вы* as a narrative device. For instance, in part 7, chapters 24, Anna and Vronsky have quarrelled. During the quarrel they say *ты* to each other. The next day Anna relives in her memory the most hurtful moments of their most recent quarrel. Not only does she remember what Vronsky had actually said to her, she also imagines and mentally puts into words much else that she thinks he had really wanted to say and uses *вы* in the utterances which she imagines

Vronsky saying to her. This is consistent with her view of what his real feelings for her now must be. (Lyons 1980, 240-243)

In Part 3, chapter 14 Karenin writes a letter to Anna. He writes in French, '(…) употребляя местоимение «вы», не имеющее такого характера холодности, который оно имеет на русском языке.' […using the pronoun *вы*, not having the same character of coldness which it has in the Russian language.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 333)

In this case the Russian pronoun 'вы' acts as a signifier for the signified French *vous*.

Dole and Garnett replace the Russian 'вы' in this sentence with the signified and more familiar French 'vous':[xxiii]

> '(…) employing the pronoun *vous* (you), which seemed to him to have less coldness and formality than the corresponding Russian word.' (Dole, 298)
>
> '(…) making use of the plural 'vous', which has not the same note of coldness as the corresponding Russian form.' (Garnett, 321)

The other translators' solutions are more target language oriented:

> '(…) using the plural pronoun *you*, which in French does not sound as cold and distant as it does in Russian.' (Maude, v.1, 322)
>
> '(…) making use of the plural '*you*', which has not the same note of coldness as the corresponding Russian form. (Edmonds, 305)
>
> (…) using the plural pronoun 'you', which does not have that that character of coldness which it has in Russian. (Pevear, 283)

The target text oriented strategy, employed by Dole and Garnett, can be described as more appropriate here than the strategy used by the other translators. Most English readers of *Anna Karenina* would be aware of the difference between the French *vous* and *tu*, whilst 'the plural *you'* can be confusing for readers, as there is no alternative singular form in the modern day English language.

When Anna is ill, Karenin forgives her and starts saying *ты* to her again. Yet that *ты* annoys Anna: she does not want to live with him any longer and does not appreciate him trying to pretend that nothing has happened:

> 'Когда он говорил по-русски и говорил ей «ты», это «ты» неудержимо раздражало Анну.' [When he spoke in Russian and said *ты* to her, this *ты* irrepressibly irritated Anna.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 496)
>
> 'When he spoke to her in Russian he used the familiar *tui*, and this *tui* irritated Anna in spite of herself.' (Dole, 432)
>
> 'When he spoke to her in Russian, using the Russian 'thou' of intimacy and affection, it was insufferably irritating to Anna.' (Garnett, 480)
>
> 'When speaking Russian to her he called her 'thou', and that always irritated her.' (Maude, v.1, 480)
>
> 'When he spoke to her in Russian and called her 'thou', it always irritated her.' (Edmonds, 449)
>
> 'When he spoke in Russian and used the intimate form of address, it was irrepressibly annoying to Anna.' (Pevear, 424)

All the translations of this sentence employ source text oriented strategies. Dole's translation here is somewhat illogical as in the previous sentence Karenin says to Anna: 'I am very grateful to thee for thy confidence' and immediately after Tolstoy's comment on how his words affect Anna, he continues: 'I am very grateful for your decision'. (Dole, 432)[xxiv] Garnett's, Maude's and Pevear's solutions work well. Garnett expands the text ('''thou'' of intimacy and affection'). Pevear replaces 'ты' with the description 'the intimate form of address'. Pevear's strategy is source language oriented because there is no intimate form of address in English in Karenin's phrase and therefore the translator/narrator implies that there is a particular intimate form in the source text that is not obvious to the English language readers. Maude adds a footnote: 'In Russian as in French and other languages the second person singular is used in conversation between intimates and also in speaking to inferiors' (Maude, 480.) But Edmonds' translation here sounds archaising and does not go well with the plain clarity of the rest of her text. If

Karenin spoke English to Anna, he would not use 'thou' as the form of address, and if he did, then no wonder that it always irritated her. The following example is similar.

Vronsky, at the outset of his relationship with Anna, chooses to speak French with her, '… избегая невозможно-холодного между ними *вы* и опасного *ты* по-русски.' […avoiding the impossibly cold between them *Вы* and the dangerous *ты* in Russian.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 221)

> '(…) thus avoiding the impossible *vui* (you) and the dangerous *tui (*thou) of the Russian.' (Dole, 199)
>
> '(…) as he always did to avoid using the stiff Russian plural form, so impossibly frigid between them, and the dangerously intimate singular.' (Garnett, 211)
>
> 'In Russian the word *you* sounded cold and it was dangerous to say *thou…'* (Maude, v.1, 211)
>
> '(…) to avoid using the word *you*, which sounded so impossibly cold in Russian, or the dangerously intimate *thou.'* (Edmonds, 204)
>
> '(…) avoiding the impossible coldness of formal Russian and the danger of the informal.' (Pevear, 187)

Different translators employ different source language oriented strategies to translate this sentence. The use of the archaic word 'thou' is more source language oriented than an omission would be, but more target language oriented than the insertion of the Russian word *вы* in the text. It is target language oriented because it attempts to replace the linguistic and cultural difference of the Russian text with the contrast between two English forms. On the other hand, it does not produce a text that could be perceived as if it was originally written in the English language and for the translators' contemporaries, because it uses an archaic pronoun 'thou'. It also presents a translator with another problem. Because the word 'thou' no longer has the same meaning in the English language as the Russian word *ты,* it is not immediately clear why is it dangerous to say 'thou'. The English word 'thou' is mainly used in prayers and is not normally identified with

dangerous intimacy between lovers. To make this sentence clearer, Edmonds has to add the word ‘intimate’ to say ‘the dangerously intimate *thou*’. It is a sensible solution, but to an English reader ‘the dangerously intimate thou’ sounds strange (religious or archaic) whilst ‘опасное ты’ sounds very familiar to a Russian reader.

In the beginning of the book Dolly feels estranged from Oblonsky because of his infidelity. She addresses him as *вы*, and then at one point she says 'ты'. Tolstoy then draws the reader's attention to the fact, and to the effect it has on Oblonsky:

- 'Ты помнишь детей, чтобы играть с ними, а я помню и знаю, что они погибли теперь, сказала она видимо одну из фраз, которые она за эти три дня не раз говорила себе.
  Она сказала ему «ты», и он с благодарностью взглянул на нее и тронулся, чтобы взять ее руку… ' [*Ты* remember the children in order to play with them, and I remember and know that they have now perished, she said apparently one of the phrases that she had been saying to herself over these three days.
  She had said ‘*ты*’ to him, and he looked at her with gratitude and moved in order to touch her hand…] (Tolstoy, v.8, 19.)

  “You think of the children, because you like to play with them; but I think of them, too, and I know what they have lost,” said she, repeating one of the phrases that had been in her mind during the last three days.
  She had used the familiar *tui* (thou), and he looked at her with gratitude, and made a movement as though he would take her hand… (Dole, 17)

  ‘You remember the children, Stiva, to play with them; but I remember them and know that this means their ruin,’ she said – obviously one of the phrases she had more than once repeated to herself in the course of the last three days.
  She had called him ‘Stiva’, and he glanced at her with gratitude, and moved to take her hand… (Garnett, 13)

  ‘You think of our children when you want to play with them, but I am always thinking of them, and I know they are ruined now,’ she said, evidently repeating one of the phrases she had used to herself again and again during those three days.
  But she had spoken of ‘our children,’ and looking gratefully at her he moved to take her hand… (Maude, v.1, 13)

  “You think of the children, Stiva, when you want to play with them, but I am always thinking of them and I know that now they are ruined,’ she said, obviously repeating one of the phrases she had been saying to herself over and over again in the last three days.

> She had called him 'Stiva', and he glanced at her gratefully and made a move to take her hand… (Edmonds, 24)
>
> 'You think of the children when it comes to playing with them, Stiva, but I always think of them, and I know that they're lost now.' She uttered one of the phrases she had obviously been repeating to herself during those three days.
> She had said 'Stiva' to him. He glanced at her gratefully and made a movement to take her hand… (Pevear, 12)

Dole's translation of this paragraph is, of course, a clear reminder to the reader that the original text is written in Russian and that the characters speak a language different from the one the translator is using. The translator comments that Dolly really said 'tui' although in her direct speech the form of address is interpreted as 'you'. The English reader of this translation would have needed some more background information about the use of *ты* and *вы* in the Russian language.

Garnett chooses a device of using Oblonsky's first name as the nearest equivalent to *ты*. Edmonds and Pevear follow the same strategy. Maude changes 'the children' to 'our children', and in his translation it is the word 'our' that makes Oblonsky look at Dolly with gratitude. Both strategies involve compensatory technique, adding to Dolly's speech the words she did not say in the original. One disadvantage of Garnett's strategy is the absence of the exact correlation between the use of first name versus first name and patronymic and the selection between *ты* and *вы* in the Russian language. In those English translations, when Dolly addresses her husband by name, she exhibits more friendliness to him than she does in the Russian text. After all, she wants to convey to him that they are now strangers – why would she address him by name? Maude, on the other hand, attempts to achieve equivalence between the more or less obligatory choices in Russian and in English. Speaking Russian, Dolly has to choose between using *ты* or *вы;* if she spoke English she would have to choose between saying 'the children', 'our children' or 'my children' as she chooses to say in her next utterance.[xxv] She says 'ты' to Oblonsky in the phrase that she has been repeating to herself during the previous three days. Although she chooses to talk to him as if he were a stranger (*вы),* in her mind she

still addresses him as *ты,* seeing him as her husband and the father of their children. If she was speaking in English, she probably would be thinking and speaking of ‘our children’ – as in her mind the children are the main factor that binds them together.

When Kitty has just agreed to marry Levin, he says *ты* to her for the first time:

> '«Я не могу верить, что ты любишь меня!»
> Она улыбнулась этому «ты» и той робости, с которой он взглянул на нее.' [‘I cannot believe that *ты* love me!’ She smiled at this *ты* and at that timidity with which he looked at her.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 474)
>
> '«I cannot believe that you love me.»
> She smiled at his *tui* and at the timidity with which he looked at her.' (Dole, 413)
>
> ''I can't believe you love me, dear!'
> She smiled at that 'dear', and at the timidity with which he glanced at her.'' (Garnett, 459)
>
> ''Dear, I cannot believe that you love me.'
> She smiled at the word 'dear', and at the timid look he gave her.' (Maude, v.1, 459)
>
> ''I cannot believe you love me, dear!'
> She smiled at that 'dear', and at the timidity with which he glanced at her.'
>
> (Edmonds, 430)
>
> ''I can't believe you love me!'
> She smiled at these words and at the timidity with which he glanced at her.' (Pevear, 405)

Dole's strategy here is similar to the one in the previous example, although this time the choice of the personal pronoun is implied rather than explained. The reader who until that moment has been reading a translation that does not normally differentiate between *ты* and *вы*, would not know that this is the first time Levin says *ты* to Kitty. Three translations use the word 'dear' as a compensation to emphasise the affectionate meaning of the Russian *ты.* Pevear drops the word 'dea*r'* (which Levin never uses to Kitty) and thus makes Kitty smile at Levin's joy over her love for him, i.e. he does not compensate.

In the Russian text Kitty, of course, smiles at Levin's use of *ты*. During the periogd of their engagement she alternates between *ты* and *вы* until the day they get married. Lyons explains that this initial asymmetry between the man's and the woman's usage of *ты and вы* before marriage was quite normal, especially when the woman was so much younger than the man. He points out that the young countess Tolstoy, too, hesitated to say *ты* to her husband on their nuptial night. (Lyons 1980, 244) When Levin comes to see Kitty on the day of the wedding, she is still unsure how to address him and eventually opts for *ты* as soon as the maid leaves the room:

> 'Как ты, как же вы (До этого последнего дня она говорила ему то «ты», то «вы»)? (…) – Уйди, Дуняша, я позову тогда, - сказала Кити. - Что с тобой? – спросила она, решительно говоря ему «ты», как только девушка вышла.' ['How do you (*ты),* how on earth do you (*вы)* (Until this last day she sometimes said to him *ты* and sometimes *вы*)? (…) Go away, Dunyasha, I will then call, - said Kitty. – What is it with you (*ты)? –* she asked, resolutely saying '*ты'* to him as soon as the maid went out.] (Tolstoy, v.9, 16)
>
> 'Is it tui? Is it vui? (Till this last day she had sometimes said tui, sometimes vui.) … "Run away, Duniasha; I will call you," said Kitty; and as soon as she had gone she asked, "What is the matter?"' (Dole, 452)
>
> ''Kostya! Konstantin Dmitrich!' (These latter days she used these names almost alternatively.) … 'Kostya, what's the matter?' she asked, definitely adopting this familiar name as soon as the maid had gone out.' (Garnett, 503)
>
> ''Why have you…? … 'What is the matter with you?' she asked as soon as the maid was gone.' (Maude, v.2, 10)
>
> ''How are you? How… 'What is the matter?' she asked as soon as the maid had gone.' (Edmonds, 470)
>
> 'What is it? …'What's the matter with you?', she asked, resolutely addressing him informally, as soon as the maid had left.' (Pevear, 445)

Only Garnett attempts to replace the hesitation between the two pronouns with an equivalent - the alternation between the formal and informal forms of address. Her strategy, however, is still source language oriented, since she replaces the Russian

pronouns with the forms of address that are clearly Russian, too. Dole's translation is source language oriented, too, but he misinterprets Kitty's initial question and fails to show her ultimate choice of *ты.* Maude and Edmonds simply choose to omit the context of Kitty's hesitation. Pevear tries to partially convey Tolstoy's intention by adding that Kitty resolutely addressed Levin 'informally' as soon as the maid had left. Still, as Lyons notices, it is sad to think that generations of readers of *Anna Karenina* will not know that Kitty hesitated between *ты* and *вы* until the day of their marriage or appreciate the significance of this fact. (Lyons 1980, 247)

However, this particular passage allows the omission of the *ты/вы* alternation without changing the rest of the dialogue. The next example can present a translator with a more difficult challenge, as a similar kind of omission would completely disrupt the text. Levin has come to see his brother Nikolai and is talking to Maria Nikolayevna, the woman his brother lives with, an ex-prostitute:

> 'Вы никогда прежде не были в Москве? – сказал ей Константин, чтобы сказать что-нибудь.
> - Да не говори ей вы. Она этого боится. Ей никто, кроме мирового судьи, когда ее судили за то, что она хотела уйти из дома разврата, никто не говорил вы.' [You (*вы*) have never been to Moscow before?' Konstantin said to her, in order to say something.
> But don't say *вы* to her. She's afraid of it. No one, except the justice of the peace, when she stood trial for wanting to leave the house of depravity, no one ever said *вы* to her.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 111)
>
> "Haven't you ever been in Moscow before?" said Konstantin, in order to say something to her.
> "Da! Don't say *vui* (you) to her. It frightens her. No one said *vui* to her except the justice of the peace, when they had her up because she wanted to escape from the house of ill fame where she was. (Dole, 100)
>
> 'Were you never before in Moscow?' Konstantin said to her, for the sake of saying something.
> 'Only you mustn't be polite and stiff with her. It frightens her. No one ever spoke to her so but the justices of the peace who tried her for trying to get out of a house of ill-fame. (Garnett, 101-102.)
>
> 'You were never in Moscow before?' Constantine asked very politely, just in order to say something.

> ‘Don’t speak to her in that way. No one but the magistrate, when she was tried for an attempt to escape from the house of ill-fame, ever spoke to her so politely… (Maude, v.1, 103)
>
> ‘You were never in Moscow before?’ Levin asked her, for the sake of saying something.
> ‘Only you mustn’t be polite and formal with her. It frightens her. No one ever spoke to her like that except the magistrate when they had her up for trying to escape from the brothel. (Edmonds, 106)
>
> ‘You’ve never been to Moscow before, miss?’ Konstantin said to her, so as to say something.
> Don’t call her “miss”… She’s afraid of it. No one, except the justice of the peace, when she stood trial for wanting to leave the house of depravity, no one ever called her “miss”. (Pevear, 91)

Dole’s translation is source language oriented because he inserts a Russian pronoun in the English dialogue. Garnett, Maude and Edmonds leave the reader wondering what is there so 'polite and stiff' or 'polite and formal' about Levin's words. Pevear replaces the pronoun of politeness with an equivalent English polite address, attempting to make the characters speak as if they were speaking English. This dynamic equivalence works, although it also forces Levin to be more formal than he is in the Russian text. He does not have to say 'Miss' in English (it is optional), whereas in Russian saying ‘вы' is the only appropriate thing he can do; saying *ты* would be inconceivably disrespectful – it could signify that Levin wishes to treat Maria Nikolayevna as a prostitute. As Hugh McLean suggests, the best solution here would have been to have Levin address her as Maria Nikolayevna, ‘but it appears that Konstantin had never been properly introduced to her’ and did not know her name and patronymic (McLean 2001, 42). Here McLean is actually mistaken since Nikolai Levin does introduce Maria Nikolayevna to Konstantin (see Tolstoy v.8, p.106-107), so addressing her by her name and patronymic would be fully acceptable. Another solution McLean suggests is phrasing the question as ‘Might I ask if this is the first time you have been in Moscow?’ (McLean 2001, 42)

To sum up, translators of *Anna Karenina* have in most cases been unable to mark the differential use between *ты* and *вы* systematically, so ‘some of the general flavour or

atmosphere is lost' (Lyons 1980, 246.) In those places where Tolstoy inserts his own comments about his characters' use of *ты* and *вы* translators had to work out different translation strategies. As Lyons comments, all these translations are 'reasonable enough' and 'none of them is very successful' (Ibid. 246-247.)

3.7. Participles and Gerunds. Russian has a great variety of participles which are used more often than participles are used in English. English makes less frequent use of participle forms than Russian, using instead a variety of syntactic structures, including particles and frequently subordinate clauses. The comparison of two of Vladimir Nabokov's stories written in Russian with their English translations done by Vladimir and Dmitri Nabokov together shows that only 50-55% of the Russian participles have been translated with English participles, 36-37% have been translated with subordinate clauses, and the rest have been paraphrased.[xxvi] Target language oriented translation from Russian into English would reduce the number of participles, replacing them with subordinate clauses. A source language oriented strategy would be to translate all the Russian participles with English participles. As Briggs writes: '(…) fundamental differences between Russian and English – such as the Russian affection for participles/gerunds as opposed to the English preference for a sequence of simpler, finite, verbs – may also lead the non-Puritan translator to make some changes in sentence structure. Indeed, *all* the translators have done something along these lines…' (Briggs 2002, 106.)

Carol Flath's favourite example of the excessive literalism of Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation of *Anna Karenina* (see Flath 2002) is 'the chilled grey' in the following sentence:

'The Karenin coachman, a fat old Tartar in a glossy leather coat, had difficulty holding back the **chilled** grey on the left, who kept rearing up by the entrance.' (Pevear 141.)

Compare this with Edmonds's translation where the Russian participle 'прозябший' [chilled] is replaced with a subordinate clause:

'The Karenins' fat old Tartar coachman, in his shiny leather coat, was finding it difficult to hold the near grey horse, **which had grown restive with the cold** and was rearing up at the portico.' (Edmonds 157.)

In part 2, chapter 22 there is a rather short sentence that has two participles in it:

a) 'Рука ее, **игравшая сорванным** листом, дрожала.' [Her hand, playing with a plucked leaf, was trembling.] (Tolstoy v.8, 221) Not only does this construction sound perfectly natural in Russian but it also produces a remarkable metrical effect.

Dole's '…her fingers played with a fallen leaf' (Dole, 200) is very inaccurate. Dole replaces the 'hand' with 'fingers', the 'plucked leaf' with a 'fallen leaf' and omits the trembling.

Garnett turns both participles into subordinate clauses :

'Her hand shook **as it played** with a leaf **she had picked**.' (Garnett, 211.)

Maude and Edmonds use one participle and a subordinate clause :

'Her hand, **toying** with a leaf **that she had pulled off**, trembled.' (Maude, v.1, 212.)

'Her hand, **toying** with a leaf **she had pulled off**, shook.' (Edmonds, 205.)

Only Pevear calques Tolstoy's construction with two participles, achieving syntactic equivalence with Tolstoy's style:

'Her hand, **playing** with a **plucked** leaf, was trembling.' (Pevear, 187.)

Another Russian sentence has a participle and a gerund:

> b) '- Ну, что Ани? – робко сказал он снизу, **глядя** на **сбегавшую** к нему Анну.' ['Well, how is Annie?' he said timidly from below, looking at Anna, running down to him.] (Tolstoy, v.9, 273)

Dole translates this sentence without a participle or a gerund:

> ''How is Ani?'' he asked anxiously, from the bottom of the stairs, **as she ran swiftly down**.' (Dole, 635)

Garnett, Maude and Edmonds preserve the gerund but not the participle :

‘‘Well, how is Annie ?’ he said timidly from below, **looking** up to Anna **as she ran** down to him.’ (Garnett, 753.)

‘‘Well, how is Annie ?’ he asked timidly, **looking** up at Anna **as she ran** down to him.’ (Maude, v.2, 267.)

‘‘Well, how is Ani ?’ he asked in a constrained voice, **looking** up to Anna **as she ran** downstairs to him.’ (Edmonds, 699.)

Pevear preserves both the gerund and the participle:

‘‘Well, how’s Annie ?’ he said timidly from below, **looking** at Anna **running** down to him.’ (Pevear, 667.)

These two examples show a certain evolution in translating Russian participles and gerunds: the earlier translations are more target-language oriented and do not attempt to match the source language grammatical forms whilst the later translators try, if possible, to match the Russian grammatical forms. Excessive adherence to the Russian grammatical forms can sometimes result in literalisms, like ‘the chilled grey’.

3.8. Word Order. Languages vary in the extent to which they rely on word order to signal the relationship between elements in the clause. Since English nouns do not have case inflections, the English language, compared to Russian, has a fixed word order. Target language oriented translation from Russian into English will follow the English word order. Source language oriented translation will match the word order in the Russian text more closely, even if that results in awkward English sentences.

For example, in part 7, chapter 5 Tolstoy writes: ‘**Второй нумер концерта** Левин уже не мог слушать.' (Tolstoy, v.9, 294.)

Dole and Maude reverse the word order in this sentence:

> 'Levin could not listen to **the second piece**.' (Dole, 650)
>
> 'Levin could not listen to **the second part of the concert**…' (Maude, v.2, 285)

Garnett, Edmonds and Pevear change the verb in order to follow the Russian word order:

> **'The second piece that was performed** Levin could not hear.' (Garnett, 772)
>
> **‘The second part of the concert** Levin could not hear.’ (Edmonds, 718.)
>
> ‘**The second part of the concert** Levin could not hear at all.’ (Pevear, 686.)

The preservation of the Russian word order allows the translators to recreate the informal tone of Tolstoy's sentence, written in a way people talk to each other, whilst changing the word order makes this sentence sound more neutral.

Another example :

> '«Боже мой, куда мне?» – все дальше и дальше уходя по платформе, думала она. **У конца** она остановилась.' ['My God, where am I to go?' – still further and further going away along the platform, she was thinking. At the end she stopped. (Tolstoy, v.9, 388)

Dole paraphrases the first sentence:

> '"*Bozhe moi!* where shall I fly?" she said to herself.
> When she reached the end of the platform, she stopped.' (Dole, 724)

Maude changes the word order in the second sentence so that it starts with the subject:

> ''O God! where am I to go?' she thought, walking further and further along the platform. She stopped **at the end of it**.' (Maude, v.2, 379)

The other translators match Tolstoy's syntax in the second sentence more closely:

> ''My God! where am I to go?' she thought, going farther and farther along the platform. **At the end** she stopped.' (Garnett, 863)

> ''Oh God, where am I to go?' she thought, continuing farther and farther along the platform. **At the end** she stopped.' (Edmonds, 801)

> ''My God, where to go ?' she thought, walking further and further down the platform. **At the end** of it she stopped.' (Pevear, 767.)

The word order in the Russian sentences is determined by what is 'new' information and what is 'given' information within the statement: new information normally appears towards the end of a statement. In this example 'the end' (of the platform) is 'given' information whilst 'she stopped' is 'new' information. Changing the word order changes the logical flow of the phrase: the reader then first learns that Anna stopped and only after that finds out that it was at the end of the platform that she stopped. Stopping is the logical conclusion of having nowhere else to go (running away from herself, from her own feelings, from the crowd of people on the platform), and the word

order in Maude's translation just does not convey it strongly enough. Dole's translation reproduces the logical flow of Tolstoy's sentence better than Maude's, but his paraphrase of the first sentence loses the image of Anna walking further and further and still trying to decide where to go.

3.9. Idioms. As Mona Baker (1992, 71-72) writes, the way in which an idiom can be translated into another language depends on several factors: whether an idiom with a similar meaning is available in the target language, how significant are the specific lexical items which constitute an idiom, etc. In a target-text oriented translation idioms can be paraphrased, omitted or replaced with idioms of similar meaning. In a source-language oriented translation a source language idiom can be inserted in the text or calqued.

In 3.4 I have discussed the high frequency of the Russian word *душа* in Russian novels in comparison with the English word 'soul' in English fiction. Idiomatic expressions containing the word *душа* in Russian are, too, more frequent than idiomatic expressions containing the word 'soul' in English. Below I shall look at the translations of some of those idioms in *Anna Karenina.*

> a) 'Катавасов, войдя в свой вагон, невольно **кривя душой**, рассказал Сергею Ивановичу свои наблюдения над добровольцами, из которых оказывалось, что они были отличные ребята.' [Katavasov, entering his carriage, involuntarily dissembling (lit. slanting his soul) told Sergei Ivanovich his observations on the volunteers, from which it turned out that they were excellent guys.] (Tolstoy v.9, 399)
>
> When Katavasov returned to his own carriage, he told Sergei Ivanovich, **with some twinges of conscience**, that he enjoyed talking with the volunteers, and declared them to be excellent lads. (Dole, 733)
>
> Katavasov went back to his own carriage, and **with** reluctant **hypocrisy** reported to Sergey Ivanovitch his observations of the volunteers, from which it would appear that they were capital fellows. (Garnett, 874)

Katavasov returning to his carriage involuntarily **prevaricated**; and in telling Koznyshev his observations of the Volunteers, let it appear that they were excellent fellows. (Maude, v.2, 391)

Katavasov returned to his own carriage and reluctantly **prevaricated**: the account he gave Koznyshev let it appear that the volunteers were excellent fellows. (Edmonds, 811)

Katavasov went to his carriage and, involuntarily **dissembling**, told Sergei Ivanovich his observations on the volunteers, from which it turned out that they were excellent fellows. (Pevear, 777.)

b) 'И потому он **кривил душой**, говоря, что едва ли есть что.' [And that's why he lied (lit. slanted his soul), saying that there was hardly anything.] (Tolstoy, v.9, 171)

(This sentence is omitted in Dole's translation.)

And so, **with some insincerity**, he said that he doubted there being anything to shoot. (Garnett, 653)

So he **stretched a point** and said they would hardly find anything there. (Maude, v.2, 163)

So he **stretched a point** and said they would hardly find anything there. (Edmonds, 608)

And so it was **with some duplicity** that he said it was not likely there would be anything. (Pevear, 578.)

c) 'У Живахова было триста тысяч долгу и ни копейки **за душой**…' [Zhivakhov had three hundred thousand of debt and not a kopeck belonging to him (lit. behind his soul)… (Tolstoy, v.9, 344)

Zhevakhov had three hundred thousand *rubles* of debts, and not a *kopek.* (Dole, 688)

Zhivahov owed three hundred thousand, and hadn't a farthing **to bless himself with**… (Garnett, 821)

Zhivakhov, whose debts amounted to three hundred thousand roubles, didn't possess a penny… (Maude, v.2, 336)

Zhivahov was in debt to the tune of three hundred thousand and hadn't a farthing **to bless himself with**… (Edmonds, 762)

Zhivakhov had debts of three hundred thousand and not a kopeck **to his name**… (Pevear, 730)

In example a) the idiom 'кривя душой' is paraphrased by all the translators. In example b) Dole omits the sentence containing the idiom. Garnett and Pevear paraphrase the idiom, while Maude and Edmonds translate it with an idiom of a slightly different meaning 'to stretch a point'. In example c) Dole and Maude omit the idiom 'ни копейки за душой', Garnett, Edmonds and Pevear translate it with idioms: 'not a farthing to bless oneself with', 'to have … to one's name'.

A Russian idiom *махнуть рукой на…*means 'to abandon hope for', 'to lose one's belief in':

> d) 'Серпуховской **давно махнул** рукой на служебную деятельность Вронского…' [Serpukhovskoy had long abandoned hope for (lit. waved his hand on) Vronsky's service activity…] (Tolstoy, v.9, 134)
>
> Serpukhovskoi had long since **given up** trying to push Vronsky along in his military career… (Dole, 548-549.)
>
> Serpuhovskoy had long **given up** all hope of Vronsky's career… (Garnett, 618)
>
> Serpukhovskoy had long ago **ceased to trouble himself** about Vronsky's career… (Maude, v.2, 126)
>
> Serpukhovskoy had long **washed his hands of** Vronsky's career… (Edmonds, 575)
>
> Serpukhovskoy had long since **given up** on Vronsky's career… (Pevear, 546)

Most translators paraphrase this idiom, but Edmonds translates it with an English idiom 'to wash one's hands of'. Its meaning is slightly different from the meaning of the Russian idiom 'махнуть рукой', since the English expression implies renouncing responsibility, whilst the Russian idiom means renouncing hope rather than renouncing responsibility: Serpukhovskoy had never been responsible for Vronsky giving up his career. Yet in some ways this English idiom is close to the one in the source text, since it contains the same lexical item 'hand' as the Russian idiom does.

Generally all the strategies for translating idioms in *Anna Karenina* are target-text oriented.

3.10. Puns. Humour is related to the beliefs and values, the practices and behaviours, the language and textual practices of a culture (Tymoczko 1999, 191.) Because humour is not universal, a translation that maintains a lexicographical equivalence to a humorous source text or closely adheres to its lexical and syntactical features will not necessarily reproduce its humorous effects. Venuti suggests that the translator's task is to to produce humorous effects that both imitate those of the original text while maintaining their differences for readerships in the receiving culture. (Venuti 2002, 25.)

Tolstoy himself liked to use wordplay (see Gusev 1961, 450) and there are several puns in *Anna Karenina.* Target-text oriented translation can deal with translating puns in three ways: paraphrase them, omit them or replace them with 'equivalent' puns in the target language. In *The Translator's Invisibility* Venuti writes that fluency and punning are mutually exclusive. 'Fluency assumes a theory of language as communication that, in practice, manifests itself as a stress on immediate intelligibility and an avoidance of polysemy, or indeed any play of the signifier that erodes the coherence of the signified.' (Venuti 1995, 60) On the other hand, Anthea Bell, whose purpose was to produce a translation of the *Asterix* stories, 'which sounds as if it had been thought and written in English' (Bell, 1996, 138) chose 'to add some extra wordplay by way of compensation' and to find different but parallel English jokes. (Ibid. 127, 131)

In a source-language oriented translation a source-language pun can be either inserted in the text with an explanation of how it works in the source language, or, if possible, calqued.

We shall now look at the translation of puns in *Anna Karenina.* The majority of them belong to Oblonsky. When, during Anna's illness, he tries to persuade Karenin to

give her a divorce Oblonsky is very pleased with himself, believing that he has succeeded in persuading Karenin.

> 'К этому удовольствию примешивалось еще и то, что ему пришла мысль, что, когда это дело сделается, он жене и близким знакомым будет задавать вопрос: «Какая разница между мной и государем? – Государь делает развод – и никому от того не лучше, а я сделал развод – и троим стало лучше…' [To this pleasure was also added the fact that a thought came to him that when this deed was done, he would ask his wife and close acquaintances the question : 'What is the difference between me and the sovereign ? The sovereign does the posting (of the guards), and nobody is better off from it, and I've made a divorce – and three people have become better off.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 506.)

This pun is a result of the polysemy of the Russian word *развод*: it can mean 'divorce' or 'examination of the guards before posting them'[xxvii].

Glyn Turnton has already pointed out that Garnett occasionally gave up the struggle to translate Russian puns (Richard Garnett 1991, 185.) She chose to omit this particular pun:

> To this satisfaction was added the fact that an idea had just struck him for a riddle, turning on his successful achievement, that when the affair was over he would ask his wife and most intimate friends. He put this riddle into two or three different ways. (Garnett, 490.)

Dole's translation of the pun is almost literal and therefore loses its wordplay:

> "What is the difference between me and a field-marshal? The field-marshal makes divorces, and nobody is better for it; while I make divorces, and three people are better off." (Dole, 441)

The three other translators replace the Russian wordplay with English wordplay:

> When the affair was all settled he would ask his wife and intimate friends a riddle : 'What is the difference between me and a chemist ?' Answer : 'A chemist makes solutions which do not make anyone happy, but I have made a *dis*solution and made three people happy !' (Maude, v.1, 489.)

Edmonds' translation is close to the Maudes':

> 'What is the difference between me and a chemist? A chemist makes solutions and no one is any the better – but *I* arranged a solution which made three people happier.' (Edmonds, 458.)
>
> 'What's the difference between me and the emperor ? He makes alliances and no one benefits, I break alliances and three people benefit…' (Pevear, 432.)

The pun in Edmonds's translation, like Tolstoy's pun, is based on the polysemy of one word ('solution') and therefore could be seen as producing an effect similar to the effect produced on a Russian reader by Tolstoy's pun. To achieve this effect, Edmonds sacrifices any reference to the word 'divorce' in the pun. Maude and Pevear, on the other hand, construct their puns around the divorce theme ('a dissolution', 'to break alliances'). Pevear's pun is based not on the polysemy but on the contrast between two rhyming antonyms 'make' and 'break'.

Oblonsky's second pun is less successful and he cannot complete it – at the same time as he fails to persuade Karenin to grant Anna divorce. The pun Oblonsky is working on is about how he spent two hours waiting on business in a Jewish man's anteroom: 'было дело *до жида,* и я *дожида*-лся.' [I had business with a Jew, and I waited.] (Tolstoy, v.9, 335) This pun is purely phonetical – based on the the phonetical identicity of the words *до жида* [with/for a Jew] and *дожида*лся [waited].

Garnett does not attempt to translate this pun either; she simply says that Oblonsky 'could not get his epigram just right'. (Garnett, 813.)

The other translators try to work out some phonetic equivalence in English : '(…) he had made a terrible pun on the word Jew, - how he had to *chew* the cud of expectation'. (Dole, 681.)

> 'I had business with a Jew, but could not get at him even to say *ajew* (adieu)'. (Maude, v.2, 328.)
>
> '(…) how he had to *chew* the cud of expectation at the *Jew's.'* (Edmonds, 755.)

'I had *much a-jew* with *a Jew.'* (Pevear, 722.)[xxviii]

Dole's translation though is more source-text oriented than those of other translators: as well as attempting to translate the pun into English, he transliterates its original Russian form in a footnote : ''Builo dyelo *do-Zhida* i ya *dozhida-lsa.''* (Dole, 681.)

The third pun in the novel involves the superimposition of languages. Vasenka Veslovsky teases Vronsky's German steward who talks about reaping-machines and concludes his economic calculations by saying in a mixture of German and Russian: 'Zu complicirt, macht zu viel Klopot.' (literally: too complicated, brings too many troubles.) To that Veslovsky, too, replies in a mixture of Russian and German : 'Wünscht man Dochots, so hat man auch Klopots'. (literally: if one wants an income, one has troubles, too.) (Tolstoy, v.9, 232.)

Dole, Garnett and Edmonds repeat Veslovsky's Russian-German phrase literally, treating it as if it was all in German, and the humour of it is lost. The Maudes repeat the phrase and explain in the footnote that 'the Russian word for income is *dokhod.* Veslovsky mispronounces it, and introduces it into a German sentence for fun.' (Maude, v.2, 224.) Pevear's phrase actually becomes a pun in English, though he retains some 'Russianness' through introducing the word 'roubles' in the pun: 'Wünscht man Roubles, so hat man auch Troubles'. (Pevear, 631.) He therefore succeeds in reproducing the humorous effects that imitate those of Tolstoy's text while maintaining the superimposition of languages. In other words, the Russian reader can appreciate the joke Veslovsky makes by Germanising the Russian words, whereas the English reader of Pevear's translation can appreciate the joke Veslovsky makes by mixing English and German words, deduce that the German steward must have mispronounced the word 'troubles' (so that it rhymes with 'roubles'), and still appreciate that the conversation is taking place in Russia.

The translation of puns reflects evolution in translations, as suggested in chapter 1 : the earlier translators are 'intimidated' by puns and tend to translate more literally; the

later translators incorporate the experience of their predecessors to preserve the pun in the target language.

<u>3.11. Translating culture-specific gestures</u>. Gestures or non-verbal signs in a novel are another form of communication between its characters. As Jones comments, Tolstoy understood and depicted deliberate and conscious non-verbal signs which people use as well as the way people often express themselves and their deepest feelings involuntarily. ‘Some gestures are conventional substitutes for speech: a frown, a pout, a wink, a barely perceptible nod, a look or a smile. Such gestures may in a commonly understood context speak more eloquently than a thousand words.’ (Jones 1978, 90-91) The difficulty for a translator arises when a particular gesture needs to be understood in a different cultural context, i.e. when it does not have the same meaning in the target language as it has in the source language. In those cases a source language oriented strategy would be simply to describe the gesture, whereas a target language oriented strategy would be to explain the communicative meaning of the gesture or even to replace the gesture with one that has an equivalent meaning in the target culture.

In part 5, chapter 33 Vronsky discovers that, in spite of his desperate persuasions, Anna has gone to the theatre where she is about to face the ostracism of the Petersburg high society. Vronsky had originally said he was not going, but now he realises how awkward his position has become:

> ‘“Что ж я-то? Или я боюсь, или передал покровительство над ней Тушкевичу? Как ни смотри, глупо, глупо… И зачем она ставит меня в это положение?» сказал он, **махнув рукой**.' [‘What about me? Am I afraid or have I passed it on to Tushkevich to chaperone her? However you look at it, stupid, stupid… And why does she put me in such a position?’ he said, waving his arm.] (Tolstoy, v.9, 132)

In English there is no equivalent description for this gesture of despair. Translators have a choice of either describing the gesture directly or explaining what the gesture is meant to communicate to Tolstoy's readers.

Maude and Pevear opt out for the former (a source language oriented solution):

> 'Why does she put me in such a position?' he said **with a wave of his arm**.' (Maude, v.2, 124)
>
> 'And why does she put me in such a position?' He said, **waving his arm**.' (Pevear, 544)

The other translators choose to explain the meaning of the gesture to their readers instead of describing the gesture (a target language oriented solution):

> 'Why should she place me in such a ridiculous position?" he said, **with a gesture of despair.**' (Dole, 547)
>
> '…And why is she putting me in such a position?' he said with a gesture of despair.' (Garnett, 616)
>
> 'Why on earth is she putting me in such a position?' he asked himself **with a gesture of despair**.' (Edmonds, 573)[xxix]

In another episode in the novel Anna's baby girl keeps crying, and her governess and the nanny suspect that the wet nurse hasn't got enough milk:

> 'Ребенок кричал еще громче, закатываясь и хрипя. Няня, **махнув рукой**, подошла к нему, взяла его из рук кормилицы и принялась укачивать на ходу.' [The baby was crying even louder, screaming and growing hoarse. The nanny, having waved her arm, came up to it, took it from the wet nurse's arms and began to rock while walking.] (Tolstoy v.8, 493)

To translate this paragraph, Dole uses a target language oriented strategy, not only explaining the meaning of the gesture but also replacing it with an equivalent English gesture and explanatory phrase:

'The old nurse **threw up her hands in despair,** took the little one from the young nurse, and rocked her in order to pacify her.' (Dole, 429)

Garnett, Maude and Edmonds explain the meaning of the gesture without describing it:

'The nurse, **with a gesture of despair**, went to it, took it from the wet-nurse's arms, and began walking up and down with it.' (Garnett, 477)

'The old nurse **with a gesture of vexation** came up and took her from the wet-nurse, and began pacing up and down, rocking the baby in her arms.' (Maude, v.1, 477)

'The old nurse, **with a gesture of despair**, came up and took it from the wet-nurse's arms, and began walking up and down, rocking it.' (Edmonds, 446)

Only Pevear uses the source language oriented strategy of translating the gesture literally:

'The nanny **waved her hand**, went over to her, took her from the wet nurse's arms and began rocking her as she walked.' (Pevear, 421)

This word-for-word translation does not really convey the meaning of Tolstoy's sentence effectively: one could wonder to whom the nanny waved her hand and why. Describing the gesture physically in the previous example was probably more appropriate as it was with a wave of his arm that Vronsky almost knocked off a table. I think that in the second example Pevear's choice of saying 'waved her hand' rather than 'waved her arm' is inaccurate since in English 'to wave one's hand' is normally only used to greet someone or to say goodbye.

Pevear's translation of the gesture analysed is more source language oriented than that of other translators, since he tends to describe the gesture rather than explain its communicative meaning.

3.12. Conclusion**.** In this chapter five translations of *Anna Karenina* have been compared in order to see which strategies each translator chooses to find a balance between an accurate reproduction of the Russian linguistic and cultural features and the conventions of the English language. It has been pointed out in chapter 1 that a translation may be radically oriented to the source text in some respects, but depart radically from the source text in other respects.

The analysis has shown that Garnett and Edmonds domesticate Russian culture-specific words more than Maude, Pevear and particularly Dole, who even foreignizes words that are not normally identified as culture-specific. Garnett and Edmonds also anglicise words denoting measures, whilst Dole, Maude and Pevear tend to use more Russian words denoting measures. In Dole's translation those are normally followed by conversions into English measures, therefore one can say that he foreignizes and domesticates at the same time. Edmonds frequently departs from the Russian text, deliberately avoiding English words, whose frequency is not as high as the frequency of the corresponding words in the Russian language, thus sacrificing fidelity to fluency. Pevear, on the contrary, often chooses to use precise, 'formal' equivalents of the words in the source text, which sometimes results in an awkward and even incorrect translation. Maude and Edmonds anglicise Russian names more than the other translators do.

The analysis also shows that Dole's translation of Russian personal pronouns *ты* and *вы* is more foreignizing than that of other translators: whenever the narrator comments on which personal pronoun the characters are using, Dole inserts transliterated Russian pronouns in the English text. The other translators tend to either omit such comments or replace the Russian personal pronouns with equivalent contrasting forms. At the same time, Dole domesticates Russian grammatical constructions more than the other translators, replacing participles and gerunds with other constructions while Pevear and

Volokhonsky translate Russian participles and gerunds with English participles and gerunds more than the other translators do.

The analysis of the translation of idioms and puns reveals that, as a rule, all the translators of *Anna Karenina* use one of the three domesticating strategies: omission, paraphrase or replacing a Russian idiom/ pun with an English idiom/ pun. Dole is the only translator to transliterate a Russian pun in a footnote to demonstrate how it works in Russian phonetically. Pevear is the only translator to turn the Russian-German pun into an English-German pun, preserving the effect of superimposition of languages and cultures.

One can therefore conclude that Dole is the most 'foreignizing' translator in the sense that he preserves what he sees as 'the form and style' (see chapter 2) of the Russian text: Russian words, names, the difference between the formal and the informal personal pronouns, description of Russian gestures. In contrast, Pevear's foreignizing is more complex since he also attempts to match Russian grammatical forms like participles and gerunds, and the word order of the Russian sentences as he recognises those characteristics not simply as Russian but also as features of Tolstoy's style. In the next chapter we shall look at Tolstoy's style in more details in order to see how different translators attempt to match it in their translations.

CHAPTER 4: TOLSTOY'S STYLE IN *ANNA KARENINA*

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter I shall try to define the most important features of Tolstoy's style and its impact on his readers in Russian. Mona Baker defines style as 'thumb-print that is expressed in a range of linguistic as well as non-linguistic features' (Baker 2000, 245). Wayne Booth suggests that the term 'style' is broadly used to cover 'whatever it is that gives us a sense, from word to word and line to line, that the author sees more deeply and judges more profoundly than his presented characters' (Booth 1983, 74). As the author writes, he creates not simply an ideal, impersonal 'man in general' but an implied version of 'himself' - different from the implied authors we meet in other men's works (Ibid. 70-71). Charles Osgood defines style as 'an individual's deviations from norms for the situations in which he is encoding, these derivations being in the statistical properties of those structural features for which there exists some degree of choice in his code' (Osgood 1960, 293). Shklovskii (1970, 198) in a chapter describing the language of *War and Peace* regrets that there is no basis on which it would be possible to construct a study of a writer's style as there is no objective analysis of the general language of literature. He points out that Tolstoy's Russian contemporaries primarily compared his language with Turgenev's. Similar comparisons awaited Tolstoy in the late 19th century England where Turgenev was already seen as 'the epitome of Russian culture and English good taste' (May 1994, 24; see also chapter 2 of the thesis). Because of the rapid increase in translations English readers, unlike Russian readers, discovered Tolstoy as the artist and as a social reformer almost simultaneously (Holman 1978, 194).

Nabokov suggests understanding Tolstoly in his whole complexity, saying that although many people love Tolstoy the artist and are bored by the preacher, it is rather difficult to separate Tolstoy the preacher from Tolstoy the artist. As the author of *Anna Karenina,* he used one method of discovering truth; in his sermons he used another, but this truth 'was always the same truth – this truth was he and this he was an art.' (Nabokov 1981, 140)

Tolstoy's own criteria for evaluating books were: a) what does the author say; b) how does he say it and c) how sincerely he says it. He justified those criteria in his articles on art and always applied them to evaluate literary and artistic works. For instance, writing about a German author von Polenz, Tolstoy commented: 'Это был большой писатель, соединивший в себе в равной степени все три свойства, нужные для писателя: всегда важное содержание, прекрасную технику и большую искренность, т.е. любовь к тому, что он описывал… [It was a great writer who had equally combined all the three qualities necessary for a writer: always important contents, excellent technique and great sincerity, i.e. love for what he described]. (Lev Tolstoy Ob Iskusstve I Literature1958, 256)

Tolstoy believed that a writer, before everything else, had to think about 'what he wanted to achieve through his art like a traveller needs to think about where he is going to'. (Ibid. 15) It is known that he was concerned about the effect his novels had on their readers. For instance, towards the end of his life he regretted that one of his readers had told him that from his novels she had acquired a love of balls and parties – things he had begun to disapprove of (Maude 1929, 420).

In *What is Art* (Tolstoy 1964, v.15, 44-231) Tolstoy criticised 'artificial art', i.e. different deliberate 'effects' that allow a writer to manipulate his readers. This possibly accounts for an earlier belief that Tolstoy had no style at all. A French writer Jean Lionnet wrote about Tolstoy:

He does not look for effects in descriptions… He looks even less for stylistic effects… He does not have a shadow of pretence or coquetry, and because of that Count Tolstoy absolutely does not need a good translator. *Anna Karenina,* which is translated badly, as it seems to us, does not lose from that and does not cease being a masterpiece. (…) The soul of the novel remains beautiful in spite of the awkwardness of the body it is dressed in. (Cit. Motyleva 1978, 10.)

Matthew Arnold thought that 'we are not to take *Anne Karenine* as a work of art'; we are to take it as a piece of life'. As Catriona Kelly brilliantly puts it, for his British contemporaries Tolstoy seemed 'a quintessential realist, whose style was at best unnoticeable, at worst an obstacle to the process of total identification with his characters that was assumed to have been his ambition as a writer'. (Kelly 2000, 592) Amy Mandelker suggests that this view of Tolstoy as a writer without any intended style could be attributed to the Western legend that poses him 'barefoot and clad in a peasant shirt, a writer whose works were cleaved from life with one mighty blow by the Creator' (Mandelker 1989, 89). In fact, as Kathleen Parthe (1982, 305) says, Tolstoy searched always for fresh devices that would captivate the reader, and that perhaps has made it more difficult to pinpoint his style.

Critics of *Anna Karenina,* like Elizabeth Stenbock-Fermor, E.B. Greenwood, Judith Armstrong, etc. have written about its 'architecture' – a term borrowed from Tolstoy's letter to professor Rachinskii. Yet, using Matlaw's metaphor, 'for all one learns of the enormous interrelatedness of the novel and its complexities – the buttresses of the structure, - so to speak, there are also keystones to be perceived. (…) Frequently an unobtrusive detail or shift in narrative focus is used to illuminate and redefine vast areas and issues broached earlier in other ways.' (Matlaw 1967, 3) In that respect L.I. Eryomina's study *Rozhdenie Obraza* (1983) deserves special attention. Its author analyses in detail the functionality of the different means of artistic expression in Tolstoy's major works – from a word as an imagery centre of the text to Tolstoy's tendency to italicise those words that represent the emotional and psychological centre of the narration. She

stresses Tolstoy's ability to transform words by creating new semantic and grammar connections between them (1983, 38).

Mandelker (1989, 90) suggests that outside of Russia scholarly interest in Tolstoy was revitalised in the 1980s largely as a result of publications by Morson, Gustafson, Emerson and some other scholars who contributed close linguistic and structural readings of Tolstoy's prose. In the UK one can see the beginning of this process already in the early 1960s, marked by the publication of R.F. Christian's *Tolstoy's 'War and Peace'* in 1962. As a reviewer in *Times Literary Supplement* wrote, Christian had 'striking points to make, which no translation has yet brought out, about Tolstoy's syntax, vocabulary and style'. The reviewer concluded: 'Mr Christian's work is sufficient to show that the application of the canons of scholarship to Tolstoy is still in its infancy'. (*Times Literary Supplement*, 28 December 1962, 1003)

As Shklovskii shows, already Tolstoy's early critics condemned his 'sentences, shoved on top of each other into ugly periods with a frequent repetition of the same words' (Cit. Shklovskii 1970, 200-201). In 1890 Konstantin Leontiev suggested that Tolstoy should change his writing in the following ways: the language should be simplified from naturalism; excessive 'spying' into characters' souls should be avoided as well as excessive portraying of emotional displays; his style should not be so imitative of peasants (Leontiev 1965, 133). The worst case of naturalism in *Anna Karenina,* to Leontiev's mind, was Vronsky's toothache before his departure for Serbia. Leontiev could see no justification of that toothache: could it not happen that a young, noble, handsome and healthy hero goes to war without a cold, without dripping saliva and without spasms in his stomach? (Ibid. 100) It took another half a century for critics to start appreciating Tolstoy's 'linkings' and for Nabokov to remark that Tolstoy punished Vronsky with toothache after so many referrals to his perfect teeth (Nabokov 1981, 234). Later on, Sydney Schultze noticed that the toothache had been mentioned several times earlier in the novel. In each case the removal of some mental strain is compared to the removal of a

tooth: e.g. Levin thinks that the news of Kitty's marriage, like having a tooth out, will cure the pain he feels. Count Bezzubov (in Russian 'without teeth') is expected to remove Karenin's mental anguish (Schultze 1982, 113-114). Everything, as Gareth Williams says, is connected to everything else. 'The lightning which strikes the oak at the end of the novel is connected with the train that kills Anna, the jam which Agaf'ya Mikhaylovna boils at the end of the novel is connected with the stove in the railway compartment at the beginning (…) (Williams 1990, 411.)

Altogether Tolstoy's symbolism and the importance of every minute detail in the text were not fully recognised until the end of the 20th century when Gustafson pointed out that 'it is this precise order of sound and rhythm that Tolstoy needs' (Gustafson 1986, 383). Earlier scholars commented on Tolstoy's love for wordplay but Gustafson pinpoints brilliant examples where Tolstoy conveys his judgement through a kind of wordplay that borders on the pun. For instance:

"И чем больше она жалела себя, тем больше ненавидела мужа. Она стала желать, чтобы он умер, но не могла этого желать, потому что тогда не было бы жалования. И это еще больше раздражало ее против него." [And the more she pitied herself, the more she hated her husband. She started to wish for him to die but could not wish it because then there would be no salary. And that irritated her even more against him.]

In the above passage from *The death of Ivan Iliich* the repetition of the morpheme of pity-love (жал) and its transformation into its etymologically related word «жалование» and then into «желание" and finally in «раздражало» creates an effect of inevitability. That the punning words reiterate the central theme - the life lived by the «inertia of salary» leads to the sickness of self-pity until death is seen and one takes pity on others – only adds to this sense of inevitability. Thus Gustafson demonstrates Tolstoy's use of paranomasia in order to achieve his intention (Gustafson 1986, 388.) As Mandelker comments, Gustafson's recognition of Tolstoy's formal craftsmanship is 'a type of analysis

found all too infrequently in the work of other scholars' (Mandelker 1989, 90). She herself, following Gustafson, offers an interesting insight in Tolstoy's use of Russian suffixes. When Anna reads a Victorian novel on the train, a paper knife accompanies her reading. As Anna's desire to be an active participant in the novel increases, the knife expands from a "ножичек" (tiny little knife) to a "ножик" (little knife) to a "нож" (knife). (Mandelker 1993, 136)

Very recently scholars have also revealed the symbolism of names of Tolstoy's characters. *Anna Karenina* was written in the aftermath of Tolstoy's intense study of Greek texts in the original, and he gave his characters commonly used Russian names whose Greek etymologies reveal something about their role in the novel. Levin's coachman Philip (from the Greek for 'lover of horses') truly loves horses; the peasant Fyodor (from Greek Theodore, meaning 'gift of God') proves to be a godsend to Levin by telling him about the peasant Platon who lives for God and remembers the soul. This Platon represents the essence of the Greek philosopher Plato's wisdom, as does the Platon in *War and Peace.* (Knapp 2003, 9)

Williams in his monograph claims to be principally concerned with the way Tolstoy attempts to influence his readers through words rather than with general description of his style in the sense of adequacy of his use of words in expressing the content of his work (Williams 1990, 2). Although one could argue that the use of words is a way of influencing readers, Williams analyses the way images are connected in *Anna Karenina* without studying its language in detail. For instance, he states that the symbols in the novel, like the railway, the snowstorm, the candle, etc, are all linked by heat. Williams's claim is that for Tolstoy will was energy in the spiritual world as heat was energy in the physical world. (Ibid. 365-380.)

This chapter will become a basis for the further analysis of how translators of *Anna Karenina* have matched Tolstoy's style in English. Anne Cluysenaar writes: 'The writer's formal and semantic material is different depending on the language. He generally

attempts to 'redeem' the 'accidents' of his particular linguistic code by assigning to them aesthetic or communicative roles' (Cluysenaar 1976, 22). To match the author's style in the target language the translator needs to consider more general differences between the two languages. For example, Mona Baker points out that Jonathan Swift's use of conjunctions is very similar to that of the Arabic language and that the question then arises as to how one might translate Swift into Arabic when the hallmark of his style is a a commonplace feature of Arabic prose. She does not, however, offer any solution (Baker 1992, 202.)

It has also been said that individuality in style reflects the author's education and the circumstances of his life (see, for instance, Rannie 1915, 301). There are a number of documents proving that whilst working on *Anna Karenina* Tolstoy became especially fond of Pushkin's prose and that, to some extent, reading Pushkin encouraged him to start writing the novel (see Gornaia 1961). Like Pushkin, Tolstoy chose to introduce his characters without any previous description – putting them straight into action. Anna is introduced when she meets Vronsky; Levin is introduced on the day he plans to propose to Kitty, Oblonsky and Dolly – after she finds out about his affair. Tolstoy's use of the peasant language in his narration can be certainly explained through his increasing fondness of the peasant life.

It has been noticed by critics of the novel that in *Anna Karenina* the author 'has many faces', his role changes with the development of the plot and form. The totality of those many 'faces' of the author creates one image whose form is the style of the novel (Kuroczycki 1977, 110).

4.2. Universalising human experience.

Wachtel (2002, 176-177) names the two imperatives governing Tolstoy's writing: a desire for specificity and a striving for universality. The finished literary work is meant to achieve balance between the two. The first phrase of *Anna Karenina* starts:

Все счастливые семьи похожи друг на друга, каждая несчастливая семья несчастлива по-своему. [All happy families are like each other, every unhappy family is unhappy in its own way.] (Tolstoy v.8, 7)

Such an opening phrase of the novel sounds like an aphorism, directly introduced in the text. The narration begins from the second sentence:

Все смешалось в доме Облонских. [Everything got mixed up in the Oblonskys' house.] (Ibid. 7)

The chapters introducing the most important events in Tolstoy's characters' lives start with introductory sentences describing general human experience before moving on to specific events in the novel. This is a feature of 18th and many 19th century novels: it helps the author to draw the reader in and at the same time creates suspense. This device points to traditionalism in narration. Through the use of this device Tolstoy universalises his story. More examples of that:

Нет таких условий, к которым человек не мог бы привыкнуть, в особенности если он видит, что все окружающие его живут так же. Левин не поверил бы три месяца назад, что мог бы заснуть спокойно в тех условиях, в которых он был нынче… [There are no such conditions which a man would not be able to get used to, in particular if he sees that everyone who surrounds him lives in the same way. Levin would not have believed three months ago that he would be able to peacefully fall asleep in those conditions in which he was today…] (Tolstoy v.9, 317.)

Для того, чтобы предпринять что-нибудь в семейной жизни, необходимы или совершенный раздор между супругами, или любовное согласие. (…) Многие семьи по годам остаются на старых местах, постылых обоим супругам, только потому что нет ни полного раздора, ни согласия.

И Вронскому, и Анне московская жизнь в жару и в пыли (…) была невыносима; но они, не переезжая в Воздвиженское, как это давно было решено, продолжали жить в опостылевшей им обоим Москве, потому что в последнее время согласия не было между ними. [In order to undertake something in family life, either complete discord between spouses or loving harmony is necessary. Many families for years stay in old places both spouses are fed up with only because there is neither complete discord nor harmony.

To both Vronsky and Anna Moscow life in heat and in dust (…) was unbearable; but they, not moving to Vozdvizhenskoe, as it had been decided long ago, continued to

live in Moscow they were both fed up, because lately there was no harmony between them. (Tolstoy v.9, 355)

The last example shows that Tolstoy introduces a general observation and in the next paragraph reiterates it, using the same words to describe a specific situation in the life of his characters. This corresponds to Tolstoy's ideal of the author's position: 'It is good when the author stands only a little bit outside of the subject so that one incessantly doubts whether it is subjective or objective.' (From Tolstoy's diary, cit. Chicherin 1968, 230) Gusev quotes Tolstoy's account of how he reworked Levin's debate with a priest four times in order make his own position less obvious, since he believed that a story could only make an impression when it is impossible to work out whose side the author is on (Gusev 1963, 299). David Lodge points out that author's intrusions in the narration are interesting in themselves because we read fiction not just for the story, 'but to enlarge our knowledge and understanding of the world' (Lodge 1992, 10). He also comments that by the end of the 19th century the intrusive authorial voice 'fell into disfavour' because it detracts from realistic illusion by calling attention to the act of narration and also claims a God-like omniscience of the author (Ibid. 10). Tolstoy may describe a specific situation and within the same sentence stress its universalism:

Как и во всех местах, где собираются люди, так и на маленьких немецких водах, куда приехали Щербацкие, совершилась обычная как бы кристаллизация общества, определяющая каждому его члену определенное и неизменное место. [As in all places where people gather, so at the small German waters to which the Shcherbatskys came there occurred as if usual crystallisation of the society, defining to each of its members a definite and unchangeable place.] (Tolstoy v.8, 252)

As R.F. Christian says, the crux of Tolstoy's thought is that every human being has features, which mark him off from every other human being. Yet at the same time human beings in the mass exhibit a sameness, conveyed by the repetition of 'as is always the case' (Christian 1967, 103). Interestingly, Alexandrov comments that in *Anna Karenina* each supposed universal is usually countered by some other claim. For instance, the narrator says that the Oblonsky household had one unnoticed but essential person who was

able to fix everything, ‘as in all family houses’. An exception to this is the Karenin household, where Anna’s baby daughter might have died from lack of care had Karenin not suddenly taken an interest in her. (Alexandrov 2004, 118)

4.3. Repetition as the ‘most characteristic feature of Tolstoy’s style’.

R.F.Christian commented on what he considered the defining factor of Tolstoy's style: ‘Repetition, then, of one kind or another, is the most characteristic single feature of Tolstoy’s style’ (Christian 1962, 154.) Gustafson states that what unites all the unique elements in Tolstoy’s style is ‘a kind of repetition in which there is an element of sameness and an element of difference’ (Gustafson 1986, 391). Tolstoy used repetition as ‘the shortest way to sense’ (Nabokov 1981, 228), to strengthen his point and also to emphasise connections between different phrases within the novel and even between its different characters. Nabokov describes Tolstoy following the contours of the thought, emotion or object until he is perfectly satisfied with his rendering – with ‘a compact series of repetitive statements, coming one immediately after the other, each more expressive, each closer to Tolstoy’s meaning’ (Ibid. 238.) An example when Tolstoy’s repetitions help to strengthen the point has already been quoted in chapter 2: Tolstoy's contempt for the merchant Ryabinin is revealed through the repetition of the word 'туго' [tightly] four times (Pevear, xvii).

An example of repetitions emphasising subtextual connections has also been quoted in chapter 2: the Russian word ‘несчастная' [unhappy, miserable] referring to the note in Dolly's hand in chapter 1 is meant to echo the adjective in the famous opening sentence of the novel. (Kelly 2002, 286) Frequently Tolstoy chooses the same epithets to describe the same characters in different stages of the novel, ‘the constant reiteration of some external detail designed to characterize an individual’ (Christian 1967, 102). For instance, the epithet *розовый* (pink) describes Kitty’s shoes and tunic during the ball, her room during her illness and her ear and finger and a piece of silk in the church during her

wedding. Anna is often described through words meaning ‘fire’, ‘to burn’, etc, i.e. a repetition with an element of sameness and an element of difference.

Gifford refers to such repetitions as 'links in Tolstoy's system of linkings', 'and since the chain is no stronger than its weakest link, the blurring of episodes will diminish the effect of the whole novel' (Gifford 1978, 26). When Levin at the end of his night on the hayrick thinks over what he ought to do, life as led by the peasants offers him 'удовлетворение, успокоение и достоинство' [satisfaction, calming down and dignity] (Tolstoy v.8, 325). As Gifford notices, two of those three terms recur with slight modification at key points in the book. Earlier on, Kitty has admired Varenka for her 'спокойствие и достоинство’ [calm and dignity] (Tolstoy, v.8, 264), and Vronsky has regretted that Anna cannot be ‘спокойна и достойна’ [calm and dignified] (Ibid. v. 8, 218.)

Another example of such use of repetitions by Tolstoy has been described by Medvedeva (1978, 269.): On the evening that was to seal Kitty and Levin's future, Levin 'отчаянно-решительным шагом вошел в гостиную и увидел ее' [with a desperate-resolute step walked into the drawing room and saw her] (Tolstoy, 8, 448.). During the time of their long separation both of them had had many changes in their lives and now they were united in their thoughts and feelings, they both wanted their future to be resolved as quickly as possible, and their resolution had an air of desperation. Kitty shook Levin's hand 'с отчаянною решительностью’ [with a desperate resolution] (Ibid. 449.) This repetition of the words with the same semantic valency (i.e. consisting of similar semantic components), though belonging to different lexical and grammatical categories, emphasises the unity of the feelings between the characters.

Sometimes Tolstoy’s repetitions of related words within one sentence create an impression of careless writing. By rejecting ‘elegant variation’ required by the traditional model of good literary prose he presents the reader with a clearer image of what he describes, be it a physical object or a metaphorical description:

Остававшийся в **углу уголок** был смахнут в пять минут. [A little corner left in the corner was wiped off in five minutes.] (Tolstoy v.8, 300.)

Он только боялся, как бы брат не **спросил** его такой **вопрос…** [He was only afraid if his brother questioned him such a question…] (Tolstoy v.8, 304.)

…уловив мыслью положение и **свесив** его на внутренних **весах**… […having caught the situation with her thought and weighed it on an internal **weighing-machine**…] (Tolstoy v.8, 87.)

(…) обычная как бы кристаллизация общества, **определяющая** каждому его члену **определенное** и неизменное место. [(…) as if usual crystallisation of the society, defining to each of its members a definite and unchangeable place] (Tolstoy v.8, 252)

Лицо это было **страшно** от изнеможденияи и **страха**. [This face was frightful because of exhaustion and fright.] (Tolstoy v.9, 267)

At the same time Tolstoy also repeats groups of words in adjacent sentences, right next to each other. For instance:

(…) ему было мучительно неловко. Мучительно неловко ему было оттого… [(…) he felt painfully awkward. Painfully awkward he felt because…] (Tolstoy v.8, 386.)

In such paragraphs the first sentence serves to introduce a specific situation/condition and the second sentence reiterates the situation/condition and explains its reasons.

Tolstoy liked to use word play in order to emphasise contrast between different meanings of the same word (see Gusev 1961), as he did in the following phrase. When Karenin, after his wife's departure, turned to religion, Tolstoy writes that he 'держался, как за спасение, за свое мнимое спасение' [he held on, as if to a salvation, to his imaginary salvation] (Tolstoy v.9, 94). In the first case 'спасение' means Karenin's own salvation from his sad position as an abandoned husband; in the second case it is a religious term.

Tolstoy also uses word play with a pair of antonyms to show Levin's uneasy happiness during the first months of his marriage:

> Эта мелочная озабоченность Кити, столь противоположная идеалу Левина возвышенного счастия первого времени, было одно из **разочарований**; и эта милая озабоченность, которой смысла он не понимал, но не мог не любить, было одно из новых **очарований**.
>
> Другое **разочарование** и **очарование** были ссоры. [This petty preoccupation of Kitty, so opposite to Levin's ideal of the exalted happiness of the first period, was one of disenchantments; and this sweet preoccupation whose meaning he did not understand but could not help loving, was one of new enchantments.
>
> Another disenchantment and enchantment were quarrels.] (Tolstoy v.9, 58)

One can therefore see that Tolstoy uses repetitions to emphasise both connections and contrasts. Below we will see more specific examples of Tolstoy's repetitions.

4.4. Repetition of verbs defining speech

With verbs defining speech Tolstoy occasionally repeats the same verb several times to introduce consecutive utterances within the same dialogue. For instance:

> - О нет! – быстро **перебила** Анна. – Он жалок, он убит раскаяньем…
> - Способен ли он к раскаянью? – **перебил**а Долли, внимательно вглядываясь в лицо золовки.
> - Да, я его знаю. Я не могла без жалости смотреть на него. Мы его обе знаем. Он добр, но он горд, а теперь так унижен. Главное, что меня тронуло (и тут Анна угадала главное, что могло тронуть Долли) – его мучают две вещи: то, что ему стыдно детей, и то, что он, любя тебя… да, да, любя больше всего на свете, - поспешно **перебила** она хотевшую возражать Долли, - сделал тебе больно, убил тебя.
>
> [- Oh no! – quickly interrupted Anna. – He is pitiful, he is killed by repentance…
> - Is he capable of repentance? – interrupted Dolly, looking into her sister-in-law's face attentively.
> - Yes, I know him. I could not look at him without pity. We both know him. He is kind, but he is proud, and now so humiliated. The main thing that touched me (and here Anna guessed the main thing that could touch Dolly) – two things torture him: that he is ashamed of the children, and that he, loving you… yes, yes, loving more than anything in the world, - she hurriedly interrupted Dolly who wanted to object, - made you hurt, killed you.] (Tolstoy v.8, 85.)

Here the triple repetition of the verb **перебил**а serves to show how Dolly's agitation in this dialogue passes to Anna: a little bit later on Tolstoy says that Anna's heart responded to Dolly's every word and facial expression.

Throughout the novel Tolstoy regularly[xxx] employs the verb *заговорить* 'to start speaking' to show outbursts of passionate heated speech, full of repetitions, characteristic of Kitty. This is how he presents a dialogue between her and Levin:

> a) 'А я тебе говорю, что, если ты поедешь, и я поеду с тобой, непременно поеду, - торопливо и гневно з**аговорила** она. – Почему невозможно? Почему ты говоришь, что невозможно?
> - Потому, что ехать бог знает куда, по каким дорогам, гостиницам. Ты стеснять меня будешь, - говорил Левин, стараясь быть хладнокровным.
> (…)
> - Вот, ты *всегда* приписываешь мне дурные, подлые мысли, - **заговорила** она со слезами оскорбления и гнева. – Я ничего, ни слабости, ничего… Я чувствую, что мой долг быть с мужем, когда он в горе, но ты хочешь нарочно сделать мне больно, нарочно хочешь не понимать…
> - Нет, это ужасно. Быть рабом каким-то! – вскрикнул Левин, вставая и не в силах больше удерживать своей досады. Но в ту же секунду почувствовал, что он бьет сам себя.
> - Так зачем ты женился? Был бы свободен. Зачем, если ты раскаиваешься? – **заговорила** она, вскочила и побежала в гостиную.'
> [- And I am telling you that if you go, I'll, too, go with you, I'll certainly go, - she started talking hastily and wrathfully. – Why impossible? Why are you saying that it is impossible?
> - Because it is to go God knows where, by which roads, hotels. You will hinder me, - Levin was saying, trying to be cool.
> (…)
> - There, you always ascribe me bad, vile thoughts, - she started talking with tears of insult and wrath. – I… nothing, no weakness, nothing… I feel that my duty is to be with my husband when he is in trouble, but you want deliberately to hurt me, deliberately do not want to understand…
> - No, it's horrible. To be some slave! – Levin screamed, getting up and unable to restrain his vexation any longer. But at the same second he felt that he was beating himself.
> - So why did you marry? You would have been free. Why, if you are repenting? – she started talking, jumped up and ran to the drawing-room.]
> (Tolstoy v.9, 66-67.)

As Jurkowska-Krupa notices, Tolstoy's direct commentary in dialogues is closely connected to a given character so that the narrator's tone acquires characteristics of the voice of the character he comments about (Jurkowska-Krupa 1988, 287). Thus the effect of repetitions in Kitty's speech is reinforced by the repetitions in the narrator's comments and the reader is better exposed to what Levin would have been experiencing, hearing a a torrent of this hurried and heated speech. Tolstoy uses the same device when describing Kitty's speech during her labour:

- Не уходи, не уходи! Я не боюсь, я не боюсь! – **быстро говорила** она. – Мама, возьмите серьги. Они мне мешают. Ты не боишься? Скоро, скоро, Лизавета Петровна…

Она **говорила быстро**, **быстро** и хотела улыбнуться. [- Don't go, don't go! I am not afraid, I am not afraid! - , she was talking quickly. – Mama, take the earrings. They get in my way. Are you not afraid? Soon, soon, Lizaveta Petrovna…

She was talking quickly, quickly and wanted to smile.] (Tolstoy v.9, 326-327)

Here again Tolstoy matches the repetitions in Kitty's speech by repeating the words 'быстро' and 'говорила' in the narrator's description of her speech. The narrator's comments then are no longer totally impartial but match the manner of the characters they describe.

4.5. Repetition of words with the same morphological element.

The following paragraph illustrates Tolstoy's repetition of the same verbal prefix in order to emphasise connections between different events. Tolstoy creates an impression of polyphony, allowing the reader to imagine many simultaneous sounds of the rapidly coming spring, by using a sequence of several verbs, starting with a prefix *–за* (signifying the beginning of an action), to emphasise the arrival of the spring enjoyed by plants, animals and people together (see Tolstoy, v.8, 180):

(…) весь теплый воздух **задрожал** от наполнивших его испарений отжившей земли. **Зазеленела** старая и вылезающая иглами молодая трава, надулись почки калины, смородины и липкой спиртовой березы, и на обсыпанной золотым цветом лозине

загудела выставленная облетавшаяся пчела. **Залились** невидимые жаворонки над бархатом зеленей и обледеневшим жнивьем, **заплакали** чибисы над налившимися бурою неубравшеюся водой низами и болотами, и высоко пролетели с весенним гоготаньем журавли и гуси. **Заревела** на выгонах облезшая, только местами еще не перелинявшая скотина, **заиграли** кривоногие ягнята вокруг теряющих волну блеющих матерей, побежали быстроногие ребята по просыхающим, с отпечатками босых ног тропинкам, **затрещали** на пруду веселые голоса баб с холстами, и **застучали** по дворам топоры мужиков, налаживающих сохи и бороны. (… all the warm air began to tremble from the vapours of the faded earth. Old and coming out in needles young grass became green, swelled the buds of the guelder-rose, the currants and the sticky spiritous birch, and on a willow sprinkled with golden bloom a hatched flitting bee began to buzz. Invisible larks began to trill over the velvet of the greens and the iced stubble, peewits began to cry over low lands and marshes filled with brown non-dissapearing water, and cranes and geeze flew high with their apring honking. Balding, moulted but in places, cattle began to bellow in meadows, bow-legged lambs began to play around their losing a wave, bleating mothers, quick-legged lads began to run along the drying paths with prints of bare feet, the merry voices of peasant women with linens started to crack on the pond, and axes of peasant men, fixing ploughs and harrows, started knocking in the yards. (Tolstoy 8, 182)

Zhdanov points out that this paragraph serves to emphasise dynamism in nature which creates similar dynamism in Levin's heart, encouraging him to start a new life and to make new plans (Zhdanov 1957, 195-196).

Three consecutive verbs with a prefix *–за* describe the behaviour of a cuckoo, three actions that happen at the same time:

> Она два раза прокуковала обычным криком, а потом **захрипела, заторопилась** и **запуталась**. [It cuckooed twice in its usual cry and then started wheezing, started hurrying and got confused.] (Tolstoy v.8, 194)

Tolstoy uses three consecutive verbs with the same prefix to describe the old princess's reaction when she sees Levin and Kitty together: '**задышала** часто и тотчас же **заплакала** и тотчас же **засмеялась'** [started breathing quickly and immediately started crying and immediately started laughing].

This use of similar verbal forms serves to emphasise the simultaneity of diverse actions, different in nature but united by the same cause.

Another kind of repetition Gustafson (1986, 379-380) calls 'one of Tolstoy's favourites' is homoeoteleuton – a rhetorical device involving the use of several words in the same form. For instance four adjectives with the same ending: 'И он представлял

себе Вронского, счастливого, доброго, умного и спокойного [And he imagined Vronsky, happy, kind, intelligent and calm)] (Tolstoy v.8, 103).

4.6. Compound epithets.

Krasnianskii comments that the analysis of Tolstoy's word formation in *War and Peace* reveals four main groups: compound adjectives and adverbs; unusual verbs formed from frequently used verbs by prefixes and suffixes; nouns formed from verbs and adjectives and words with the prefix *не-* (non-) (Krasnianskii 1987, 5). The same categories of non-standard vocabulary can be found in *Anna Karenina,* too.

Nabokov has praised the precision of Tolstoy's epithets, such as 'шлюпающие' (limply plopping – Nabokov's translation) and 'шершавые' (scabrous) as 'applied so magnificently to the slippery insides and rough outsides of the choice oysters Oblonski enjoys' (Nabokov 1981, 199). Frequently, in order to find the most precise description, Tolstoy uses compound epithets, such as 'перспектива блестяще-счастливая' (a brilliantly happy prospective), 'с (…) мрачно-уныло смотрящими добрыми глазами' (with somberly-gloomily looking kind eyes), притворно-сочувственных фраз (fakingly compassionate phrases), скромно-торжествующею улыбкой (with a modestly-triumphant smile), осторожно-отчетливые звуки (carefully distinct sounds) and the fantastic compound adjective 'тюлево-ленто-кружевной-цветной' (gauzily-ribbonly-lacily-colourful), used to describe a crowd of ladies at the ball. Vinogradov notices that Tolstoy depicts a feeling as a mixture of contradictory emotions; he therefore denies an existence of a 'pure', un-mixed feeling (Vinogradov 1939, 190). For instance, the foreign prince Vronsky entertains has 'презрительно-добродушное отношение' (a scornfully kindly attitude) towards him. Eryomina (1983, 11) points out that compound epithets allow the most precise psychologically motivated characteristics, always given from a character's point of view. For instance, it is Vronsky who perceives (or imagines) 'презрительно-добродушное отношение' of the prince to himself.

Tolstoy uses compound adjectives to describe his characters and their emotions as changeable and full of contradictions. For instance, Chicherin comments that Anna is now kind now evil, now joyful now gloomy, now clever now senseless. Sometimes she knows how to behave herself and then she is totally unable to restrain her emotions (Chicherin 1968, 262). In part 5, chapter 33 Vronsky notices 'сдержанно-возбужденное сияние' (reservedly animated shine) of Anna's face and in part 6, chapter 24, he looks into her 'возбужденно-сдержанное' (animatedly reserved) face. Medvedeva notices that these two adjectives, although different only by the order of their parts, are not semantic doubles: in the first case animation takes over, in the second case it is a sign of agitation Anna has already managed to conquer (Ibid. 268.)

Tolstoy's use of compound epithets therefore allows his reader a better vision of the way his characters see each other and communicate with one another.

4.7. Nouns formed from verbs and adjectives and words with the prefix *не-* (non-).

As suggested in 4.6, Tolstoy frequently uses nouns formed from verbs or adjectives. As Vinogradov (1949, 413) comments, in the second half of the 19th century those nouns were appearing more frequently in bureaucratic and journalistic language. Amongst those in *Anna Karenina* are such verbal nouns as 'натачивание' ('во время натачивания косы' – during the sharpening of the scythe), вставание (вернувшись домой к вставанью жены и свояченицы – having returned home for the getting up of his wife and sister-in-law), etc. Presumably Tolstoy used those verbal nouns instead of clauses as 'the shortest road to sense'. They create an effect of almost comically compressed narration, when the narrator is so sparing with his words that his language sounds almost telegraphic. It helps the narrator to come across as trustworthy, since by rejecting elegant writing he is less likely to want to manipulate his reader.

Tolstoy's use of words with the prefix *не-* (non-) can be explained through his tendency to contrast good and bad, the antitheses of his religious-philosophic doctrine.

When Levin shows his diary to Kitty he is tormented by two things: 'его неневинность и неверие' [his non-innocence and unbelief]. Talking to Sviyazhsky, he mentions two troubles of the Russian peasantry: poverty and non-education ('необразование').

This word formation shows that Tolstoy created new words whenever he felt that they allowed him to formulate his thoughts more precisely. It also confirms Shklovskii's statement about the similarity of Tolstoy's language to the official language of military books of his time (Shklovskii 1970, 202-203).

4.8. Shifting points of view in narration.

Lodge argues that the choice of the point(s) of view from which the story is told is the most important decision the novelist has to make, for it fundamentally affects the way in which readers will respond to the fictional characters and their actions. (A totally impartial narration is unlikely to engage our interest unless we know whose story it is.) The story of adultery will affect us differently according to the point of view from which it is told. *Madame Bovary,* narrated from the point of view of Charles Bovary, would be a very different book from the one we know. (Lodge 1992, 26) Gifford (1978, 26) has commented that Tolstoy does not, like Flaubert and his other French contemporaries, satisfy himself with a *pointilliste* rendering of sensations, but identifies with the character at the given moment. Alexandrov (2004, 135) comments that *Anna Karenina,* in comparison to many 19th century novels, has the higher-than-usual ratio of passages presenting the viewpoints of characters to those giving the viewpoint of the narrator. It is characteristic of Tolstoy's style that a character's thoughts are first expressed in narrative and then repeated in direct or indirect speech.

In part 5, chapter 31 Anna has just returned to the hotel after the visit to her son. Distressed, she looks at Vronsky's photograph, suddenly remembers that he has been the cause of her present suffering and at the same time feels an unexpected surge of love for him. 'But where is he?' she thinks with a feeling of reproach and for the next three

paragraphs the narrator keeps referring to Vronsky the way Anna refers to him as ‘он’: ‘она ждала его’ [she waited for him], ‘что если он разлюбил ее’ [what if he had stopped loving her], etc. In Anna’s mind therefore ‘он' (he) becomes a substitute for Vronsky's proper name. Then she hears the bell ring and comes out to the drawing room.

> ‘Когда она вышла в гостиную, не он, а Яшвин встретил ее взглядом. **Он** рассматривал карточки ее сына, которые она забыла на столе, и не торопился взглянуть на нее.' [When she came out into the living room, it was not him but Yashvin who met her eyes. He was looking at the pictures of her son that she had left on the table, and did not hurry to look at her.] (Tolstoy, v.9, 127)

It is not immediately clear to whom 'он’ (he) refers in the second sentence of this paragraph – Vronsky or Yashvin. However, in the next paragraph Tolstoy repeats that it was Vronsky who was looking at Seryozha’s pictures. The use of the personal pronoun in the second sentence is confusing as it could refer to either Vronsky or Yashvin. It is, however, justifiable, since the paragraph is written from Anna’s point of view, while she is only thinking of Vronsky as ‘он'. In Tolstoy’s narration *он* normally stands for the person in the centre of his character's thoughts. This is how Kitty sees Vronsky at the ball:

В левом углу залы, она видела, сгруппировался свет общества. Там была до невозможного обнаженная красавица Лиди, жена Корсунского, там была хозяйка, там сиял своею лысиною Кривин, всегда бывший там, где свет общества; туда смотрели юноши, не смея подойти; и там она нашла глазами Стиву и потом увидала прелестную фигуру и голову Анны в черном бархатном платье. И *он* был тут. [In the left corner of the hall, she saw, the light of the society had grouped. There was the impossibly bare beauty Lydie, Korsunsky's wife, there was the hostess, there was Krivin shining with his bald head, who always was there where the light of the society was; in that direction youths were looking, not daring to come close; and there with her eyes she saw Stiva and then saw the charming figure of Anna in a black velvet dress. And *he* was here.] (Tolstoy v.8, 96)

The narrative point of view changes throughout the novel. When Anna starts talking to Yashvin, Vronsky is referred to as 'Вронский' again by a narrator 'a little bit outside of the subject'. Anna, too, is referred to as 'Анна' rather than 'она' (she):

Поговорив несколько времени и заметив, что Вронский взглянул на часы, Яшвин спросил ее, долго ли она пробудет еще в Петербурге, и, разогнув свою огромную фигуру, взялся за кепи.

- Кажется, недолго, - сказала она с замешательством, взглянув на Вронского.
- Так и не увидимся больше? – сказал Яшвин, вставая и обращаясь к Вронскому. (…)
- Приезжайте обедать ко мне, - решительно сказала Анна (…)
- Очень рад, - сказал Яшвин с улыбкой, по которой Вронский видел, что Анна очень понравилась ему.

Яшвин раскланялся и вышел, Вронский остался позади.

[Having talked for some time and having noticed that Vronsky had glanced at the clock, Yashvin asked her whether she would stay in Petersburg much longer, and, having unbended his enormous figure, took the cap.

- It seems, not long, - she said with perplexity, having glanced at Vronsky.
- So we won't see each other again? – said Yashvin, standing up and addressing Vronsky.
- Come to dine with me, - resolutely said Anna. (…)
- Very glad, - said Yashvin with a smile, by which Vronsky could see that he liked Anna very much.

Yashvin bowed and went out, Vronsky stayed behind.]

As soon as Yashvin goes out, Vronsky and Anna are referred to as 'он' and 'она' again. The narrative point of view can shift from one character to another one quite unexpectedly. For example, chapter 30, part 1 is all written from Anna's point of view. In the end of the chapter she meets her husband at the train station in St Petersburg, and then in the beginning of chapter 31 the point of view unexpectedly shifts to Vronsky. The meeting of Anna and her husband is thus seen through Vronsky's eyes. Vronsky approaches them and greets Karenin but Karenin shows him that he wishes to be on his own with Anna, and Vronsky disappears almost without trace for the next couple of chapters. It is interesting that Lodge calls inconsistency in handling point of view 'one of the commonest signs of a lazy or inexperienced writer' and suggests that, unless it is done 'according to some aesthetic plan or principle', the reader's involvement will be disturbed. (Lodge 1992, 28)

The narrator's identification with a particular character is further demonstrated by the fact that the narrator tells the character's impression of the reality as if it was objective reality. When Levin rushes to see Kitty in order to ask her parents' permission to marry her, he hires a cabby. The cabby's horse was good and 'старалась бежать, но не двигалась с места' [tried to run but did not move from the spot]. Since in the next sentence Levin gets to the Shcherbatsky's house, it is clear that the horse was in fact moving and that it only seemed to Levin in his impatience that it was not. Thus Tolstoy describes Levin's vision as it was objective reality.

Describing Levin's embarrassment about the neckline of Sviyazhsky's sister-in-law (part 3, chapter 26), Tolstoy states that Levin imagined the neckline was made on his behalf and adds 'вероятно ошибочно' (probably mistakenly). This 'вероятно' (probably) also points out to the fact that Levin's thoughts are told from his and not the impartial narrator's point of view: the author does not claim to know exactly what happens in the minds of all the characters he has created. The reader therefore cannot know for certain whether Levin was mistaken or not.

4.9. Tolstoy's compound comparatives.

The formula of Tolstoy's compound comparatives is: 'He/she felt like a person who…' A few examples:

Кити испытывала после обеда и до начала вечера чувство, подобное тому, какое испытывает юноша пред битвою. [Kitty experienced after lunch and until the beginning of the evening a feeling similar to the one a youth experiences before a battle. (Tolstoy v.8, 60.)

Воспоминание о зле, причиненном мужу, возбуждало в ней чувство, похожее на отвращение и подобное тому, какое испытывал бы тонувший человек, оторвавший от себя вцепившегося в него человека. The reminiscence of the evil caused to her husband evoked in her a feeling akin to revulsion and similar to the one a man who was drowning would experience who had torn away another man clinging to him .(Tolstoy v.9, 37.)

Увидев Алексея Александровича (…), он поверил в него и испытал неприятное чувство, подобное тому, какое испытал бы человек, мучимый жаждою и добравшийся до источника и находящий в этом источнике собаку, овцу или свинью, которая и выпила и взмутила воду. [Having seen Aleksey Aleksandrovich (…) he believed in him and experienced an unpleasant feeling similar to the one a man, tortured by thirst, who got to a spring and finds in this spring a dog, a sheep or a pig who has both drunk and muddied the water, would experience.] (Tolstoy v.8, 127-128.)

Теперь он испытывал чувство, подобное тому, какое испытал бы человек, возвратившийся домой и находящий свой дом запертым. [Now he experienced a feeling similar to the one a man would experience who returned home and found his house locked.] (Tolstoy v.8, 173-174)

Again, the effect of such similes helps Tolstoy to universalise experiences of his characters. It also helps readers to imagine those experiences more clearly: for example, many young men of Tolstoy's circle would have remembered how they felt before battles. Those readers who have never experienced finding their houses locked or pushed drowning men away would still be able to imagine what it would feel like more clearly than if the narrator wrote: 'Kitty felt agitated' or 'Karenin was annoyed', etc.

4.10. Retardation: 'a comic build-up to a rhetorical climax'.

Hugh McLean describes characteristic Tolstoyan creating suspense syntax as 'a comic build-up to a rhetorical climax, in which a series of anticipatory phrases is finally resolved by a long-awaited verb' (McLean 2001, 43).

Examples:

Совершенно незаметно, не взглянув на них, а так, как будто уж некуда было больше посадить, Степан Аркадьич посадил Левина и Кити рядом. [Totally unnoticeably, without looking at them but so as if there was nowhere else to seat them, Stepan Arkadyevich seated Levin and Kitty next to each other.] (Tolstoy v.8, 452).

Он послал седло без ответа и с сознанием, что он сделал что-то стыдное, на другой же день, передав все опостылевшее хозяйство приказчику, уехал в дальний уезд к приятелю своему Свияжскому (…) [He sent the saddle without an answer and with a conscience that he had done something shameful, the very next day, having handed all the household he was fed up with to the steward, left for a far-off district to his friend Sviiazhsky's (…)] (Tolstoy v.8, 380).

In both sentences Tolstoy slightly mocks Levin's emotional state. In the paragraph preceding the first sentence Levin feels as if him and Kitty were the only people in the world – and somewhere beneath, far away, are «все эти добрые славные Каренины, Облонские, и весь мир» [all those kind glorious Karenins, Oblonskys, and the whole world] (Tolstoy v.8, 452.) The sentence characterises Oblonsky, who, acting as a matchmaker and a perfect host, whilst remaining in the world 'beneath' actually helps Levin to sit next to Kitty and thus to maintain that feeling that him and Kitty are the only people in the world above. According to Levin's emotional state, Oblonsky is supposed to be unnoticeable, and the anticipatory beginning of the sentence allows Levin a little bit more time to stay in that world where other people's actions are vague and unnoticeable. The word order in this sentence is foregrounded in that the subject is preceded by an unusually long adverbial construction.

In the second sentence Levin still struggles to avoid Kitty, so he ignores Dolly's invitation to come and visit and sends a saddle Dolly has asked for - without a letter. Then he is embarrassed about what he has done, and the retardation allows him time to feel ashamed, to decide what to do, and to temporarily disappear from Kitty's neighbourhood to his friend's snipe marshes.

In the following sentence Tolstoy uses the same device of retardation to mock Karenin's self-importance:

Обдумывая, что он скажет, он пожалел о том, что для домашнего употребления, так незаметно, он должен употребить свое время и силы ума(…) [Thinking over what he would say, he regretted that for domestic use, so unnoticeably, he had to use his time and powers of intellect(…)] (Tolstoy v.8, 172.)

This word order allows Tolstoy to keep the reader in suspense in respect of what Karenin mainly regretted as he was preparing for a conversation with Anna.

4.11. Compound sentences: coexistence of different events in the same period.

Motyleva (1978, 163) suggests that the most important peculiarity of Tolstoy's syntax is the coexistence of events, remote from each other in time and space, within one period. For example:

Стремов, тоже член комиссии и тоже задетый за живое, стал оправдываться, - и вообще произошло бурное заседание; но Алексей Александрович восторжествовал, и его предложение было принято; были назначены три новые комиссии, и на другой день в известном петербургском кругу только и было речи, что об этом заседании. [Stremov, also a member of the commission and also cut to the quick, began to justify himself – and generally a stormy meeting happened; but Alexey Alexandrovich triumphed, and his suggestion was accepted; three new commissions were appointed, and the next day in a certain Petersburg circle there was no other talk than of this meeting.] (Tolstoy v. 8, 374)

Two days and a lot of discussions have been skipped over and packed into one sentence – they only matter for Tolstoy in that they contribute to the description of Karenin's state of mind on the next day (before his meeting with Anna). On that next day, upon awakening, he is immediately (within the same sentence) transported into his office:

На другое утро, во вторник, Алексей Александрович, проснувшись, с удовольствием вспомнил вчерашнюю победу и не мог не улыбнуться, хотя и желал казаться равнодушным, когда правитель канцелярии, желая польстить ему, сообщил о слухах, дошедших до него, о происшедшем в комиссии. [The next morning, on Tuesday, Alexey Alexandrovich, having woken up, with pleasure recalled yesterday's victory and could not help smiling, even though he wished to seem indifferent, when the office manager, wishing to flatter him, announced about the rumours that had reached him, about what had happened in the commission.] (Ibid. 374)

4.12. Use of rhythm in *Anna Karenina.*

Amongst 'many faces' of *Anna Karenina* Kuroczycki notices its lyricism, meaning that some parts of it can be read as free verse (Kuroczycki 1977, 118). For example:

Она не выглянула больше.
Звук рессор перестал быть слышен,
чуть слышны стали бубенчики.
Лай собак показал, что карета проехала и деревню, -

и остались вокруг пустые поля,
деревня впереди
и он сам, одинокий и чужой всему,
одиноко идущий
по заброшенной большой дороге.
[She did not look out again.
The noise of the springs ceased to be audible,
barely audible became the bells.
The dogs' barking showed that the coach had passed through the village,
and empty fields stayed around,
a village ahead,
and him, lonely and alien to everything,
lonely walking
along the abandoned great road.] (Tolstoy v.8, 326)

In those lines Tolstoy arranges his material in the groups of three, a device that Christian called a classical, rhetorical arrangement 'Tolstoy was particularly addicted to' (Christian 1967, 106). The first sentence consists of three short sentences, a list of three subjects follows «остались»: «поля», «деревня» and «он сам», three definitions convey Levin's loneliness. Through those lines Tolstoy shows Levin in one of his most lyrical moods – he has just seen Kitty and is about to realise that he still loves her. The rhythm of the lines helps the reader to immerse in a highly emotional state of mind, close to Levin's. To achieve that, Tolstoy creates sentences, different from the majority of sentences in his novel in that they do not have a conglomeration of clauses, events, characters or parentheses but express one idea, one event, involving no more than two people. Rhythm has a sense-differentiating function in Tolstoy's prose.

Also lyrical is the scene where Anna recognises Vronsky at a train station:

И в это же время,
как бы одолев препятствие,
ветер посыпал снег с крыш вагонов,
затрепал каким-то железным оторванным листом,
и впереди плачевно и мрачно
заревел густой свисток паровоза.
[And at the same time,
as if overcoming an obstacle,
the wind started scattering snow from the roofs of carriages,
blustering with a torn iron leaf,

and ahead a deep whistle of the steam engine
howled mournfully and morosely.]
(Tolstoy v.8, 124-125)

Or after Kitty and Levin's son was born:

Бессильно опустив руки на одеяло,
необычайно прекрасная и тихая,
она безмолвно смотрела на него
и хотела и не могла улыбнуться.
[Listlessly lowering her hands on the blanket,
unusually beautiful and quiet,
she was silently looking at him
and wanted and could not smile.] (Tolstoy v.9, 327)

This sentence splits in four poetic lines: the first and the third one consist of four units each, the second and the fourth lines consist of three units each. This symmetry between the lines is reinforced by the symmetry of the adverbs «бессильно» and «безмолвно» and makes the sentence sound even more like a verse.

Eikhenbaum writes that Tolstoy's work and especially *Anna Karenina* were influenced by lyrics by Tyutchev and Fet (Eikhenbaum 1960, 213-218), suggesting that the night before Levin meets Kitty on her way to Ergushovo is described according to the motives of Fet's lyrics. Simmons also points out that in the famous passage where Anna, before her suicide, reads the book of her life by candlelight, the force of the passage is 'not in the symbolism of the rather commonplace image, but in the rhythm and suggestiveness of the language' (Simmons 1973, 101-102).

Gustafson also shows Tolstoy's use of 'imitative syntax' – i.e. syntax which is designed to imitate the action of which the sentence tells. Commenting on the description of Count Rostov's dance, Gustafson writes, 'If you read the passage carefully, your foot taps to the beat of the dance'. (Gustafson 1986, 377-378) The same could be said about waltz in *Anna Karenina:*

И Корсунский завальсировал, умеряя шаг, прямо на толпу в левом углу залы, приговаривая: «Pardon, mesdames, pardon, pardon, mesdames», и, лавируя между морем кружева, тюля и лент и не зацепив ни за перышко, повернул круто свою даму, так что открылись ее тонкие ножки в азурных чулках, а шлейф разнесло опахалом и закрыло им колени Кривину. [And Korsunsky went waltzing, measuring his step, straight onto the crowd in the hall's left corner, saying: 'Pardon, mesdames, pardon, pardon, mesdames', and manoeuvring amongst the sea of lace, tulle and ribbons and without snagging a feather, turned his lady sharply, so that showed her delicate legs in laced stockings, and her train was swept like a fan and covered Krivin's knees.] (Tolstoy v.8, 96)

This sentence, with it several verbs and gerunds, seems to swing round and round like waltz. Certain triple elements of it, like “кружева, тюля и лент» correspond to the triple time of waltz.

4.13. Peasant expressions

The language of *Anna Karenina* is full of colloquialisms and peasant expressions – not only in the speech of peasants but also in the author’s narration. Between *War and Peace* and *Anna Karenina* Tolstoy decided that the language used by peasants was ‘the best poetic regulator. You may want to say what is superfluous, high-flown, unhealthy – the language will not allow it, while our literary language has no bones; so pampered, you may talk whatever rubbish you like – it all resembles literature.’ (From Tolstoy’s letter to N.N. Strakhov, cit. Gifford 1978, 24) Ten years after *Anna Karenina* Tolstoy expressed his ideal of writing in a letter to his wife:

How I’d like to translate everything into the Russian language so that Tit (a peasant name) understood (…) From communication with professors there is wordiness, hard-wordiness and obscurity, from communication with peasant men there is compression, beauty of the language and clarity. (Lev Tolstoy Ob Iskusstve I Literature 1958, 420)

Chicherin rightly points out that Tolstoy's language in *Anna Karenina* was influenced by his work on *Azbuka* (Chicherin 1968, 255) and that can explain the abundance of peasant expressions in the novel. By 1870 Count Tolstoy had started to resent the monopolisation of knowledge by the educated classes. The four books of *Azbuka,* published in 1872, contain 193 works and more than a half of them are adaptations of other sources (Greek, Indian, Arabic, Russian, etc.) which Tolstoy translated into the language spoken by and understandable to peasants. A reader, unfamiliar with village life, will find it difficult to understand every word in those scenes of *Anna Karenina* where Tolstoy describes the Russian village and rural realities.

An example:

В сорока шагах от него, ему навстречу, по той большой дороге-муравке, по которой он шел, ехала четверней карета с важами. Дышловые лошади жались от колей на дышло, но ловкий ямщик, боком сидевший на козлах, держал дышлом по колее, так что колеса бежали по гладкому. [In forty paces from him, towards him, along that big road-grass he was walking, a coach-and-four with big suitcases on its roof was driving. The shaft-horses were pressing towards the shaft, away from the ruts, but the adroit coachman, sitting sideways on the box, was keeping the shaft on the rut so that wheels were running over the smooth.] (Tolstoy v.8, 325)

These two sentences are full of words denoting rural realities ('важи', 'дышло', 'козлы'), and 'дорога-муравка' is a peasant poeticism. Peasant expressions help Tolstoy to recreate the atmosphere of a Russian village.

The author's narration also reveals grammatical errors and idiosyncrasies of peasant speech:

Он пахал под картофель плугою, как он называл плуг, взятый у помещика. [He ploughed for potatoes with 'плуга' (a plough, put incorrectly in the feminine gender instead of the correct masculine one), as he called the plough, taken from the landowner.] (Tolstoy v.8, 382)

In this sentence the use of the incorrect gender alone shows that the peasant is not really familiar with the plough and perhaps tries to assimilate an unknown word/concept to a more familiar one *coxa* (see the example below) which belongs to the feminine gender.

(…) и резцы в плугах не завинтят, а поснимают и потом скажут, что плуги выдумка пустая и то ли дело соха Андреевна, и т.п. [(…) and won't screw the cutters in the ploughs but take them off and then say that ploughs are a silly invention and nothing like 'соха Андреевна' (a wooden plough with a patronymic Andreevna or a plough, the daughter of Andrei). (Tolstoy v.8, 283)

Despite Tolstoy's idealisation of the peasant language, his narration occasionally parodies peasant speech, like in the example below:

Несмотря на уверения старосты о пухлявости сена и о том, как оно улеглось в стогах и на его **божбу** о том, что все было по-**божески**, Левин настаивал на своем(…) [In spite of the elder's assurances about the flabbiness of the hay and about how it had settled in the stacks, and of his god-swearing that everything was done in a godly manner, Levin insisted on his point(…) (Tolstoy v.8, 321.)

This aspect of Tolstoy's prose – the use of peasant expressions and peasants' grammatical errors – makes it particularly difficult for translators.

4.14. Voices of individual characters.

The characters of *Anna Karenina* have their own, very individual and social, manners of speech. Karenin, for example, speaks the language of a highly placed bureaucrat. Even talking to his wife, he uses the style of official documents, saying 'Я желаю' (I wish) instead of a more usual 'Я хочу' (I want), 'Я требую соблюдения внешних условий' (I demand the preservation of the external conditions)', 'Я был далек от той интерпретации' (I was far from that interpretation,) etc.

The merchant Ryabinin speaks a typical merchant language, faking respect for Oblonsky whose forest he is determined to buy. Ryabinin uses meaningless words like 'положительно' (positively) and 'окончательно' (finally) and the particle –c in order to emphasise his servile respect:

Положительно всю дорогу пешком шел. [Positively walked all the way]

(…) окончательно ничего не укупишь. [(…) you won't buy anything finally.]

Помилуйте, по нынешнему времю воровать положительно невозможно. Все окончательно по нынешнему времю гласное судопроизводство… [Have mercy, nowaday stealing is positively impossible. Everything is finally nowaday open court business.]

Очень можно, куда угодно-с… [Very possible, wherever you please, sir…]

The old prince Shcherbatsky has a good sense of humour and likes to mock people by applying new meanings to Russian words: ‘тютьки' (used to define young scatterbrains), 'шлюпики' (to define old club members), 'пустобрех' (a hunting term, here used to define a doctor who speaks a lot of nonsense), etc.

Tolstoy's translator needs to be able to preserve individual manners of speech. This is even more important as Tolstoy himself appreciated heteroglossia in other writers' works. For instance, he praised a Russian writer Ertel for the variety of speech manners in his books: «Старик-дворовый говорит одним языком, мастеровой – другим, молодой парень – третьим, бабы – четвертым, девки – опять иным». (Lev Tolstoy Ob Iskusstve I Literature 1958, 426) The preservation of the superimposition of languages in the novel is a challenge for translators.

4.15. Use of proverbs in the novel.

McKenna (1998, 1) points out a special role of proverbs in Russian literary texts. He explains their importance by the predominance of a peasant population, the vast majority of whom could not read or write until the beginning of the 20th century and therefore created a rich oral tradition to sustain their cultural history and folk values. In the 1870s Tolstoy was particularly preoccupied with proverbs (see Donskov 1998, 61).

The characters of *Anna Karenina* use a variety of Russian proverbs in everyday conversations – sometimes to show their wit, sometimes to fill an awkward silence. As

Hogan notices, the way each character cites a proverb and the context in which they cite it reflects different nuances of interpretation conveyed by character and point of view (Hogan 1998, 76-77). For instance, Karenin uses a proverb in order to say something in an awkward situation: 'Я заехал еще привезть тебе денег, так как соловья баснями не кормят…' [I've also stopped by to bring you money, since one doesn't feed a nightingale with fables]. Karenin says it to Anna, when the situation between them has become awkward and they don't have much to talk about. Karenin's speech is fairly full of cliches anyway, so the proverb does not resolve the awkwardness of the situation, and Anna blushes. As Tolstoy comments in the following chapter, Karenin's unusual talkativeness on that day was simply an expression of his inner anxiety (Tolstoy v.8, 245).

In other situations, when proverbs are used by Tolstoy's favoured characters, they are received by their collocutors better than Karenin's proverb is received by Anna.

Levin, 'in whom more than in any other of his male characters Tolstoy has portrayed himself' (Nabokov 1981, 145) greets Agafya Mikhailovna with a proverb: 'В гостях хорошо, а дома лучше…' [It's good visiting, but better at home].

Both Levin and the old prince Shcherbatsky (portrayed by Tolstoy as someone rejecting everything that is false – be it spiritualism, pietism, insincerity, etc.) refer to proverbs in order to entertain other guests at Oblonsky's dinner: '(…) волос долог…' [Hair is long] The old prince talking about the social position of women does not complete the proverb 'Волос дорог, ум короток' [hair is long, intellect is short]. Since all the guests know the proverb, the prince does not need to complete it for everyone to know his point of view.

'Кондуктор, противно пословице, хотел по платью проводить меня вон…' [The conductor, contrary to the proverb, wanted to see me off according to my dress]. Here Levin alludes to the proverb 'по одежке встречают, по уму провожают' [one is greeted, according to his clothes, yet one is seen off, according to his intellect].

The use of proverbs is a clear indication that the character is speaking Russian as opposed to French and contributes to the russification of Tolstoy's novel. Also, use of proverbs ties in with Tolstoy's desire to universalise. Levin's remark about being happier at home, for instance, conveys a general idea that could have been expressed by the narrator as well as by the character.

4.16. Foreign words and turns of speech in the novel.

Vinogradov (1949, 407-410) showed that Tolstoy's language was largely based on the literary styles of the Russian language of Pushkin's tradition with its Western European influence. In the second half of the 19th century the language of nobility incorporated French and English words and expressions. Thus, at this stage Tolstoy uses foreign words in two sets of circumstances: 1) characterisation of upper class characters 2) when he reveals his own class background and target audience by using foreign words in his narration.

Tolstoy's high society characters speak Russian frequently using foreign words – especially French and English. It seems as normal for them to speak French as it is to speak Russian. English is used for occasional fashionable words and phrases: e.g. *pluck, all right, the zest is gone*[*]. Sometimes those words (or whole phrases) are simply inserted in the otherwise Russian text of *Anna Karenina*:

- С препятствиями все дело в езде и в pluck, - сказал англичанин. [-With obstacles the whole matter is riding and pluck, - said the Englishman. (Tolstoy v.8, 214.)

In other cases, Tolstoy calques French idioms – in order to create the impression of a dialogue being in French (Vinogradov 1949, 406-407):

[*] Here *the zest* is probably used to describe the forbidden passion between Anna and Vronsky in the meaning 'a piquant quality which adds to the enjoyment of something'. OED shows this meaning of the word in Thackeray: 'The sense that, perhaps, it was imprudent to take a cab or drink a bottle of wine, added a zest to those enjoyments'.

Алексей сделал нам ложный прыжок… [Alexey has done us a false leap…] (Tolstoy v.8, 348.)

Они забросили чепцы за мельницы. [They've thrown their bonnets over the mills.] (Tolstoy v.8, 350)

Sometimes Tolstoy uses an expression and then points out that it is an English expression or a French expression:

(…) это качество была *кровь,* та кровь, которая *сказывается*, по английскому выражению. [(…) this quality was *blood,* that blood which *tells,* according to the English expression.] (Tolstoy v.8, 215)

(…) меньшой брат его был славный малый, с сердцем, *поставленным хорошо* (как он выражался по-французски) [his younger brother was a nice fellow with a heart *well placed* (as he expressed himself in French) (Tolstoy v.8, 282.)

Russian gerunds normally refer to an action on the part of the subject and, as a rule, are not used in impersonal constructions with a logical subject or when the action expressed by the predicate and the action expressed by the gerund relate to different subjects. Tolstoy, however, as Borras and Christian notice, 'is a conspicuous offender', not always following this rule (Borras and Christian 1977, 209):

Взглянув в эти глаза, **каждому казалось**, что он узнал ее всю… [Having looked into these eyes, to everyone it seemed that they had got to know the whole of her…] (Tolstoy v.8, 353.)

Зная вашу дружбу к нему, **вы поймете** меня. [Knowing your friendship towards him, you will understand me.] (Tolstoy v.9, 97.)

Тут, **глядя** на ее стол с лежащим наверху малахитовым бюваром и начатою запискою, **мысли его вдруг изменились**. [Here, looking at her

table with a malachite blotter and a started note lying on top, his thoughts suddenly changed.] (Tolstoy v.8, 171)

Such use of gerunds, participles and adverbs in the Russian language can be ascribed to the influence of French syntax on the Russian language (Christian 1967, 108). In one sense, it creates an impression of hurriedly written and grammatically incorrect sentences, yet it has been suggested that incorrect grammar in Tolstoy's texts can lead to a particular sincerity of the tone, similar to an oral expression of a strong feeling (Gusev 1961, 434).

4.17. Inconsistencies of the narration

Kuroczycki believes that *Anna Karenina* is in parts inconsistent. For instance, in part 1 chapter 5 Levin walks into Oblonsky's office. Oblonsky says 'Так и есть! Левин, наконец!' [That is right! Levin, at last!] Levin had not been mentioned previously, so there was no reason for Oblonsky to exclaim 'Так и есть!' In an earlier version of the novel Oblonsky sees a man behind the glass door and says to his neighbour: 'Looks like Konstantin Levin'. In this context it would have been natural for Oblonsky to confirm his earlier guess, but later on Tolstoy removed that scene, so Oblonsky's exclamation remains unjustified. (Kuroczycki 1977, 124)

Later on in the novel Tolstoy writes:

Доктор подтвердил свои предположения насчет Кити. Нездоровье ее была беременность. [The doctor confirmed his suppositions concerning Kitty. Her unwellness was pregnancy.] (Tolstoy v.9, 86)

Kuroczycki comments that there was nothing to confirm, since before that sentence there had been no mention of any doctor's suppositions (Kuroczycki 1977, 124). In fact, previously the doctor had said that Kitty's illness was a result of tiredness and anxiety (Tolstoy v.9, 85).

Those inconsistencies could be potentially explained by Tolstoy's boredom with his novel. Tolstoy wrote to Strakhov about his desire 'спихнуть как можно скорее с рук скучную, пошлую Анну Каренину' [to do away, as soon as possible, with the boring, vulgar *Anna Karenina*] (Tolstoy, polnoe sobranie sochinenii, 1952, v.62, 197). On the other hand, as it has been shown above, Tolstoy frequently changes narrative points of view and therefore the same event can be told more than once. Following similar logic, one could accept that certain events do not make their way in the novel at all. For instance, had the story of Kitty's illness been told from the doctor's point of view, the reader may have learnt more about what the doctor thought. If no person in real life can know everyone else's thoughts, then maybe the reader does not need to know them, either.

4.18. <u>Conclusion</u>: In *Anna Karenina* Tolstoy universalises many human experiences, frequently describing specific situations and then pointing out their universalism. Therefore the same situation is often described more than once as Tolstoy introduces a general observation and in the next paragraph uses the same words to describe a specific situation in the life of his characters.

Dramatic situations in *Anna Karenina* are often narrated from multiple points of view. The behaviour of Anna and Vronsky at the ball is mainly seen through Kitty's eyes, Vronsky's race is depicted both from the narrator's and from Anna's points of view. Anna's anxiety at the races is also seen through the eyes of Karenin who pretends to be calm. When Anna, shortly before her suicide, visits Dolly, Tolstoy briefly interrupts the story told from Anna's point of view to show Kitty's compassion for Anna.

Tolstoy's repetitions work on different levels: he repeats situations, characters' thoughts, phrases, words, lexical stems and prefixes, and through those repetitions emphasises connections between different characters in the novel and between natural events. Thus, when the spring comes, the air begins to tremble, larks begin to trill, lambs

begin to play and lads begin to run, and Tolstoy achieves this effect through using a sequence of verbs with the prefix –за.

As an author, Tolstoy aims to be ‘just outside of the subject’, and his personal attitude is sometimes subtly revealed through narrator’s intrusions. Often these intrusions appear in the form of single words, contrasting with the rest of the sentence, for instance, when Tolstoy mocks high class representatives using a low register verb to define their actions. Sometimes, in order to find the most accurate description of what he ‘has seen’ (Arnold 1978, 353), Tolstoy chooses to use compound epithets.

Although Tolstoy wrote *Anna Karenina* for the educated upper classes, its style was strongly influenced by his work on *Azbuka* and stories for peasant children. Tolstoy’s inclination to use peasant lexis can be explained through his own words in his article on the language of popular books: 'я советую не то что употреблять простонародные, мужицкие и понятные слова, а советую употреблять хорошие, сильные слова и не советую употреблять неточные, неясные, необразные слова. [I advise not the use of colloquial, peasant and understandable words, but I advise to use good, forceful words and don't advise to use inaccurate, unclear, imageless words] (Lev Tolstoy Ob Iskusstve I Literature 1958, 411)

That search for clear and forceful words also explains Tolstoy’s use of neologisms and rarely used words, such as ‘проюркнули', 'капуйское', 'молочность', compound epithets, etc.

Long sentences in *Anna Karenina* alternate with short ones. Again, Tolstoy’s work on *Azbuka* influenced his syntax in that many chapters of *Anna Karenina* start with short sentences, the way folk tales do. Short sentences are also used to show emotional tension of the characters. Generally the narrator’s tone changes to match the emotional state of his characters, varying from a dry, business-like narration to lyrical free verse.

Tolstoy himself wrote that a certain ‘incorrectness’ of language and style was a characteristic feature of his writing (Cit. Shifman 1961, 414). This ‘incorrectness’ possibly

stems from the fact that he was less interested in prose aesthetics than in captivating his readers with the feelings he himself had experienced or discussing the global issues of his time.

Already in the beginning of Tolstoy's writing career a similar judgement was pronounced by critic Druzhinin over Tolstoy's early work:

> Каждый Ваш недостаток имеет свою часть силы и красоты, почти каждое Ваше достоинство имеет в себе зернышки недостатков. (…) Наверно можно сказать, что все пассажи, писанные с любовью, у Вас превосходны, но чуть Вы холодеете, у Вас слог путается и являются адские обороты речи. [All your defects have their share of strength and beauty, and almost all your qualities bear within them the seed of a defect. (…) One can say with certainty that all the passages you have written with love are wonderful; but as soon as you grow cold your words get mixed up and diabolical turns of phrase appear.] (Druzhinin in L.N. Tolstoy 1962, 186)

As a reviewer in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* noticed, Tolstoy's writing style 'creates the impression of realism' insofar as 'he sets Life impartially before you, and leaves you to draw your own conclusions' (Knowles 1978, 364). Iurii Olesha made a remarkable observation describing Tolstoy's style as

(…) единственно встречающийся в русской литературе по свободе и своеобразной неправильности стиль. (…) стиль Толстого есть проявление его бунта против каких бы то ни было норм и установлений. [The only style in Russian literature characterised by freedom and by a distinctive incorrectness. (…) Tolstoy's style is an expression of his rebellion against any norms and sets] (Olesha 1965, 207).

Translating Tolstoy's 'incorrectness of language and style' into English presents his translators with a dilemma. Gifford suggests that 'the English reader has formed certain expectations, based on what he regards as the appropriate idiom for a modern novel' (Gifford 1978, 20). The translators can therefore either preserve the effect of Tolstoy's style on the readers or domesticate it.

In the next chapter I shall therefore compare the source and target texts in order to see which translators have matched Tolstoy's style more closely.

CHAPTER 5: TRANSLATING TOLSTOY'S STYLE AND VOICES OF HIS CHARACTERS

> Partisans of 'flowing' translation often object to my translators : 'That's not the way to say it in German (in English, in Spanish, etc.) ! I reply: 'It's not the way to say it in Czech either.' (Milan Kundera, Cit. Adam Thirlwell, The Guardian 08.10.2005)

5.1. Introduction. As it was suggested in chapter 1, at the first level of foreignization translators try to reproduce such 'basic 'building blocks'' of the source text (Baker 1992, 111) as vocabulary and grammar. This chapter will deal with the higher levels of foreignizing a translation of a novel, such as imitaton of Tolstoy's style and of his characters' voices. As Natasha Sankovitch writes, if we believe Strakhov's assertion that Tolstoy thinks about every single word, every single turn of phrase (see chapter 2), 'it becomes particularly lamentable that translators have tended to smooth over his at times awkward and ungrammatical prose' (Sankovitch 1998, 19.) It is also important to recognise that Tolstoy was very sensitive to the tone of his character and their peculiar idiom (Gifford 1978, 25). At the highest level of foreignization the translators will attempt to convey how their individual manners of speech, foreign accents, etc. stand out in the novel.[xxxi]

5.2. Occasionalisms and neologisms. As shown in chapter 4, Tolstoy liked to produce new words or to stretch the meaning of existing words. A Russian word *молочность* means 'a capacity to produce milk' and is normally used when talking about cows. In the following sentence Tolstoy stretches the meaning of the word, using it to describe a woman's ability to produce milk:

> 'Здоровая на вид, нарядная кормилица, испугавшись, что ей откажут, проговорила себе что-то под нос и, запрятывая большую грудь, презрительно улыбнулась над сомнением в своей **молочности**.' [The healthy-looking, well-dressed wet-nurse, frightened that she would be dismissed, muttered something under her nose and, hiding away the large breast, scornfully smiled at the doubt about her **milkiness** = capacity to produce milk.] (Tolstoy v.8, 493)

The majority of translators paraphrase this sentence:

> The young nurse, a healthy looking woman of fine appearance, sprucely dressed, who was afraid of losing her position, smiled scornfully, and muttered to herself, as she fastened her dress, at the idea of anybody's suspecting that she hadn't **enough nourishment**. (Dole, 429)
>
> 'The smartly dressed and healthy-looking nurse, frightened at the idea of losing her place, muttered something to herself, and covering her bosom, smiled contemptuously at the idea of doubts being cast on her **abundance of milk.**' (Garnett, 477)
>
> 'The healthy-looking wet-nurse in her finery, evidently afraid of being dismissed, muttered something to herself as she covered her well-developed breast, and smiled contemptuously at the idea of her not **having sufficient milk**.' (Maude v.1, 477)
>
> 'The trim, healthy-looking wet-nurse, frightened at the idea of losing her place, muttered something to herself and, covering her large breast, smiled scornfully at the notion of her not **having sufficient milk**.' (Edmonds, 446-447.)

Only Pevear chooses to use the rare word 'milkiness' as the closest (formal) equivalent of *молочность*, which results in a 'foregrounded' English sentence:

> 'The healthy-looking, well-dressed nurse, afraid that she might be dismissed, muttered something under her breath and, hiding away her big breast, smiled contemptuously at any doubt of her milkiness.' (Pevear, 421)

Pevear's translation of this sentence is source-language oriented since he follows Tolstoy in creating a word, based on the word-formative model: the English suffix –ness is normally equivalent to the Russian –ость, although the English word 'milkiness', usually refers either to colour or texture. Paraphrasing Berman (2000, 297), one could describe this translation as a destruction of meaning in favour of the letter. Dole's translation is the most domesticating: he paraphrases the word 'молочность' and, giving in to Victorian

prudishness, chooses to use ‘nourishment’ instead of ‘milk’ and omits reference to ‘breast’.

Tolstoy occasionally produced new words with a help of suffixes, prefixes, etc (see Gusev 1961, 436-437). For instance, in part 5 chapter 15 of *Anna Karenina* there is a following sentence: ‘Что-то стыдное, изнеженное, капуйское, как он себе называл это, было в его теперешней жизни.' [something shameful, pampered, capuan, as he called it to himself, was in his present life.] (Tolstoy v.9, 63) Tolstoy formed this unique word *капуйский* from the name of the Italian town where the army of Hannibal had become physically and morally soft. Tolstoy frequently used the word *kanya* in his diaries to indicate the state of contented laziness. In the annotation to the Russian text (Tolstoy 1963) ‘капуйское' is defined as Tolstoy's neologism.

In order to bring the reader to Tolstoy, translators would need to explain the word in the English text, too. Most of them, however, translate ‘капуйское' as 'Capuan' without explaining the origin of the word. Only Pevear and Volokhonsky reveal that the word 'Capuan' is peculiar to Tolstoy (Pevear 832), thus pointing out Tolstoy's liking for creating neologisms.

5.3. Metonymical Use of Names. Kazakova suggests that antonomasia (metonymical use of proper names in the sense of common nouns) belongs to one of those types of metonymy that are particularly difficult for translators. The most common strategy for translating names, familiar within a source culture but unknown within a target culture, is decipherment of the metonymical attribute together with the destruction of the metonymy. (Kazakova 2002, 260-264.) Occasionally Tolstoy’s characters use proper names in the sense of common nouns. When a proper name is used in plural, it normally loses its special character and becomes a common noun. When Oblonsky tells him about Levin’s failed proposal to Kitty, Vronsky says:

> 'Да, это тяжелое положение! От этого-то большинство и предпочитает знаться с **Кларами**. Там неудача доказывает только, что у тебя недостало денег, а здесь – твое достоинство на весах'. [‘Yes, it is a difficult position! This is why the majority prefers to deal with **Claras**. There a failure only proves that you didn’t have enough money, and here your dignity is on the scales.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 75)

The name ‘Клары’ is used as a euphemism for prostitutes. As Maude wrote in his *Life of Tolstoy,* women for Tolstoy were divided into two groups: those sacred ones who could be looked on as possible wives or sisters, and those who could be paid for and possessed for short periods’. (Maude 1929, v.1, 55) At the time when Tolstoy was contemplating *Anna Karenina,* he actually believed that prostitutes were necessary for the society. Semon quotes an extract from Tolstoy’s 1870 letter to Strakhov in which he writes that prostitutes are ‘*indispensable* for the family… Imagine London without its 80000 Magdalenes.’ (Semon 1984, 440)

While ‘Magdalene’ is clearly a biblical reference to London prostitutes Russian writers and poets have traditionally used exotic names to refer to prostitutes. It is easy to deduce the meaning of ‘Клары’ in Vronsky’s speech from its context in the phrase. Translators therefore have a choice between ‘deciphering’ the metonymy or letting the target reader deduce the meaning of the word from the context – as, at least, a modern Russian reader would have to. Maude chooses to clarify the phrase thus:

> ‘Yes, it is a painful position! That is why so many prefer **women of the *demi-monde*.**’ (Maude, v.1, 67-68)

Edmonds clarifies the phrase, too, but preserves the ‘Claras’ in it*:*

> ‘That’s why most of us prefer **our Claras, the women of the *demi-monde*.**’
>
> (Edmonds, 74)

The other translators stay closer to the original text (although Dole seems to misunderstand it):

'That is why so many men prefer to be faithful to **their Claras**…' (Dole, 68)

'That's why most fellows prefer to do with **Klaras**.' (Garnett, 66)[xxxii]

'That's why most of us prefer the company of **Claras**.' (Pevear, 60)

This example shows that Maude and Edmonds choose to clarify Tolstoy's vocabulary – even within the text itself rather than explain the meaning in a footnote.

5.4. <u>'Iconic richness'.</u> Target-language oriented translation replaces the words in the original with words that have a similar meaning but may lack their sonorous or onomatopoeic richness or their iconic richness – that is what Berman called qualitative impoverishment. According to Berman, a term is iconic when, in relation to its referent, it 'creates an image', enabling a perception of resemblance (Berman 2000, 291.) A translation that is source language oriented would preserve the sound effect, even if the resulting text sounds obscure.

In the table below several onomatopoeic words from the hunting scenes in *Anna Karenina* are presented together with their translations:

Tolstoy	Dole	Garnett	Maude	Edmonds	Pevear
'Щебетали' 'chirped'	Chirping	Twittered	Chirped	Chirped	Chirped
'Заухал' [hooted]	Lifted his voice	Hooted	Hooted	Hooted	Hooted
'Прокуковала' [cuckooed]	Uttered	Uttered cuckoo-call	Called	Called	Cuckooed
'Захрипела' [made a hoarse sound]	Ceased hoarsely	Gave a hoarse, hurried call	Called hoarsely	Gave a hoarse call	Wheezed
'Гуканье' [a thick jerky sound or cry]	A strange sound	A cry	A cry	Whine	Yelping
'Чик! Чик!' (the gun	*Tchik! Tchik!*	Tchk! Tchk!	Click! click!	Tchk! Tchk!	Chik! chik!

click)					
'Хорканье' [wild loud snorting]	Hoarse little cry	Guttural cry	Cry	Hoarse cry; guttural cry	Chirring
'Шлепнулась' [fell down with a plop, thud]	Fell	Fell with a splash	Fell with a heavy thud	Fell with a heavy thud	Plopped
'Ржал' [neighed]	Neighing	Whinnying	Whinny	Whinnying	Whinnying
'Чмоканье' [smacking]	(omission)	Whir	Cry	Whirr	Creeching

The table shows that Pevear and Volokhonsky are more attentive to Tolstoy’s onomatopoeic words than the earlier translators. For instance, in their translation the cuckoo’s sound is described as ‘cuckooing’ and ‘wheezing’ rather than ‘giving a hoarse call’. They find a word ‘chirring’ for ‘хорканье’ and match Tolstoy’s style more closely by using one word ‘plopped’ to render the woodcock’s heavy fall – rather than Garnett’s ‘fell with a splash’ or in the Maude and Edmonds translations ‘fell with a thud’. Maude does not really attempt to match Tolstoy’s description of animal sounds, using the same word ‘cry’ for ‘гуканье’, ‘хорканье’ and ‘чмоканье’.

Iconic richness could, perhaps, be seen in a broader sense, outside of onomatopoeic words. Nabokov has commented upon the curious echo of the word 'тютьки' that the old prince Shcherbatsky applies to young Muscovite bachelors in the name of the hairdresser ‘Тютькин’ Anna sees on the day of her death (Nabokov 1981, 225.) This word 'тютьки' is translated as 'tiutkof[xxxiii] (mashers)' by Dole, as 'young bucks' by Garnett and Edmonds and 'young puppies' by Maude. Only Pevear translates 'тютьки' with a phonetically close

'twits' and changes the name of the hairdresser to Twitkin, thus preserving the phonetic resemblance. The other translations lose the 'perception of resemblance' between the word 'тютьки' and the hairdresser's name.[xxxiv]

Pevear and Volokhonsky therefore succeed in preserving the sound effect of Tolstoy's Russian more than the other translators do.

5.5. Lexical Repetitions. Languages differ in the level of lexical repetitions they normally tolerate (see Baker 1992, 210.) As stated in 4.3, repetitions are the most characteristic feature of Tolstoy's style.

Gifford refers to Tolstoy's repetitions as 'links in the system of linkings' and points out that 'since the chain is no stronger than its weakest link, the blurring of episodes will diminish the effect of the whole novel'. By that he means that 'when Tolstoy's moral vocabulary is so spare, reduced to the bedrock essentials, something of the novel's steady, even obsessive preoccupation is lost should the translator retreat however slightly from singleness of meaning' (Gifford 1978, 26-27).

If a translator sees repetitions as redundant, domesticating strategy will be to reduce the number of repetitions 'for the sake of a facile elegance' (Matlaw 1976, 736), which can result in a leveling of narrative style. Foreignizing strategy will preserve the repetitions and produce a possibly less elegant language text. As May (1994, 59) points out, translators sometimes work to reflect peculiarities of certain characters' speech in their English prose, since those peculiarities contribute to the readers' understanding of the character; but when the individualities of speech do not belong to a character, when they are offering a generalised sense of the narrating voice, then they often disappear altogether in translation. Because of this kind of 'correction', readers of Tolstoy's works in English are less likely to appreciate the significant role repetition plays in Tolstoy's writing (Sankovitch 1998, 22.)

a) Nabokov has commented on Tolstoy's repetition of the word 'необыкновенный' [extraordinary] in his description of the early scene at the railway station where the watchman is killed. He pointed out that there is no actual connection between the two words 'необыкновенный' [extraordinary], but the repetition is characteristic of Tolstoy's readiness to admit awkwardness if 'that is the shortest way to sense'. (Nabokov 1981, 228.):

> 'Пробежал и начальник станции в своей **необыкновенного** цвета фуражке. Очевидно, что-то случилось **необыкновенное**.' [The stationmaster, in his cap of an extraordinary colour, also ran past. Evidently something extraordinary had happened.] (Tolstoy v.8, 80)

The translators of *Anna Karenina*, with the exception of Pevear, do not preserve this repetition:

> 'The station-master followed in his curiously colored *furazhka* (uniform-cap). An accident had happened…' (Dole, 72)
>
> ‘The stationmaster too ran by in his **extraordinary** coloured cap. Obviously something **unusual** had happened.’ (Garnett, 71-72.)
>
> ‘The station-master with his **peculiar** coloured cap also ran past them. Evidently something **unusual** had happened.’ (Maude, 72)
>
> ‘The station-master too ran by in his **strange** coloured cap. Obviously something **unusual** had happened.’ (Edmonds, 78)
>
> ‘The stationmaster, in a peaked cap of an **extraordinary** colour, also ran past. Evidently something **extraordinary** had happened.’ (Pevear, 64)

In respect of this scene Pevear points out that in previous English translations such passages have generally been toned down if not eliminated. ‘We have preferred to keep them as evidence of the freedom Tolstoy allowed himself in Russian.’ (Pevear and Volokhonsky 2001, xvii)

b) In the scene where Anna is waiting for her son to come home, Tolstoy uses the verb *сидеть* [to sit] in three consecutive sentences:

'На этот раз Сережи не было дома, и она была совершенно одна и **сидела** на террасе, ожидая возвращения сына, ушедшего гулять и застигнутого дождем. Она послала человека и девушку искать его и **сидела** ожидая. Одетая в белое с широким шитьем платье, она **сидела** в углу террасы за цветами и не слыхала его.' [This time Seryozha was not at home, and she was completely alone and sat on the terrace, waiting for the return of her son, gone for a walk and caught in the rain. She had sent a manservant and a maid to look for him and sat waiting. Wearing a white dress with broad embroidery, she sat in the corner of the terrace behind the flowers and did not hear him.]
(Tolstoy, v.8, 220)

On this day the boy was not at home. Anna was entirely alone, and **sitting** on the terrace, waiting for her son's return, as the rain had overtaken him while out on his walk. She had sent a man and a maid to find him. Dressed in a white embroidered robe, she was **sitting** at one corner of the terrace, concealed by plants and flowers, and she did not hear Vronsky's step. (Dole, 198)

This time Seryozha was not at home, and she was completely alone. She was **sitting** on the terrace waiting for the return of her son, who had gone out for his walk and had been caught in the rain. She had sent a manservant and a maid out to look for him. Dressed in a white gown, deeply embroidered, she was **sitting** in a corner of the terrace behind some flowers, and did not hear him. (Garnett, 210)

This time Serezha was not at home, and Anna was quite alone, **sitting** on the verandah waiting for the return of her son, who had gone for a walk and had been caught in the rain. She had sent a man and a maid-servant to look for him and **sat** waiting. She wore a white dress trimmed with wide embroidery, and as she **sat** in a corner of the verandah behind some plants, did not hear Vronsky coming. (Maude, v.1, 211)

This time Seriozha was not at home, and she was quite alone, **sitting** on the terrace waiting for the return of her son, who had gone for a walk and been caught in the rain. She had sent a manservant and a maid to look for him, and **sat** waiting. She wore a white gown with deep embroidery, and **was sitting** in corner of the terrace behind some flowers, and did not hear him. (Edmonds, 204)

This time Seriozha was not at home, and she was quite alone, **sitting** on the terrace, waiting for the return of her son, who had gone for a walk and had been caught in the rain. She had sent a man and a maid to look for him, and **sat** waiting. She wore a white gown with deep embroidery, and **was sitting** in corner of the terrace behind some flowers, and did not hear him. (Pevear, 186)

The two earlier translations of this paragraph reduce the three occurrences of the verb 'to sit' to two. The verb occurs three times in Maude's translation, but their translation of the paragraph is still domesticating insofar as Tolstoy refers to Anna and

Vronsky as ‘она' [she] and ‘он’ [he], whereas Maude calls them Anna and Vronsky. Edmonds’ translation and Pevear’s translation of this paragraph follow Tolstoy’s text more closely.

c) Another example:

> 'На первого ребенка, хотя и от нелюбимого человека, были **положены** все силы любви, не получившие удовлетворения; девочка была рождена в самых тяжелых условиях, и на нее не было **положено** и сотой доли тех забот, которые были **положены** на первого.' [On the first child, although by an unloved man, had been put all the energies of love that had not received satisfaction; the girl had been born in the most difficult conditions, and on her not even the hundredth part had been put of those cares that had been put on the first one.] (Tolstoy, v.9, 125)

The participle ‘положены (-о)' is repeated three times in one sentence. None of the translators uses the same verb three times to translate this sentence. Garnett and Pevear repeat a verb twice (but Garnett splits the sentence into two):

> On her first child, though the child of an unloved father, had been **concentrated** all the love that had never found satisfaction. Her baby girl had been born in the most painful circumstances and had not had a hundredth part of the care and thought which had been **concentrated** on her first child. (Garnett, 609)

> To the first child, though of a man she did not love, had **gone** all the force of a love that had not been satisfied; the girl, born in the most difficult conditions, did not receive a hundredth part of the care that had **gone** to the first child. (Pevear, 538)

There are no repetitions in the Maude or Dole’s translations:

> All the strength of her affection had heretofore **centered** in her first-born, although he was the child of a man whom she did not love. Her daughter was born under the saddest circumstances, had never **received** the one hundredth part of the care which she had **spent** on Serozha. (Dole, 541)

> Upon the first child, though by an unloved man, all Anna’s unsatisfied capacity for loving was **lavished**; but the girl was born under most trying conditions and had not **received** a hundredth part of the care **given** to the first child. (Maude, v.2, 117)

Although Edmonds' translation of this paragraph is very similar to Garnett's, Edmonds makes sure there are no repetitions:

> On her first-born, although he was the child of a man whom she did not love, had been **concentrated** all the love that never found satisfaction. The little girl had been born in the most painful circumstances and had not **had** a hundredth part of the care and thought **bestowed** on the first child. (Edmonds, 567)

d) In part 5, chapter 31, Tolstoy, penetrating Anna's thoughts and feelings, uses the adverb 'вдруг' three times in four consecutive sentences and repeats it again in the end of the same paragraph:

> '«Да, вот он!» – сказала она, взглянув на карточку Вронского, и **вдруг** вспомнила, кто был причиной ее теперешнего горя. Она ни разу не вспоминала о нем все это утро. Но теперь **вдруг,** увидав это мужественное, благородное, столь знакомое и милое ей лицо, она почувствовала неожиданный прилив любви к нему.
>
> "Да где же он? Как же он оставляет меня одну с моими страданиями?" – **вдруг** с чувством упрека подумала она, забывая, что сама скрывала от него все касавшееся сына. Она послала к нему просить его прийти к ней сейчас же; с замиранием сердца, придумывая слова, которые она скажет ему все, и те выражения его любви, которые утешат ее, она ждала его. Посланный вернулся с ответом, что у него гость, но что он сейчас придет и приказал спросить ее, может ли она принять его с приехавшим в Петербург князем Яшвиным. "Не один придет, а со вчерашнего обеда он не видал меня, - подумала она, - не так придет, чтоб я могла все высказать ему, а придет с Яшвиным". И **вдруг** ей пришла странная мысль: что, если он разлюбил ее?' (Tolstoy, v.9, 126.)

In the translation of this passage Dole only uses suddenly once, simply omitting all the other repetitions of 'вдруг':

> '"*Da!* There he is," she said to herself, and as she looked at him she **suddenly** remembered that he was the cause of all her present suffering.
>
> Not once had she thought of him all the morning; but the sight of this manly and noble face, which she knew and loved so well, brought a flood of affection to her heart.
>
> "*Da!* Where is he? Why does he leave me alone a prey to my grief?" she asked with bitterness, forgetting that she herself carefully concealed from him everything concerning her son. (…) And a cruel thought crossed her mind: "If he no longer loves me?" (Dole, 541-542.)

Garnett uses ‘suddenly’ once, ‘sudden’ once and repeats ‘all at once’ three times:

> ‘Oh, here he is!’ she said, glancing at the portrait of Vronsky, and she **suddenly** recalled that he was the cause of her present misery. She had not once thought of him all morning. But now, coming **all at once** upon that manly, noble face, so familiar and so dear to her, she felt a **sudden** rush of love for him.
>
> ‘But where is he? How is it he leaves me alone in my misery?’ she thought **all at once** with a feeling of reproach, forgetting she had herself kept from him everything concerning her son. (…) And **all at once** a strange idea came to her: what if he had ceased to love her?’ (Garnett, 610)

Maude repeats ‘suddenly’ three times:

> ‘Yes, there he is!’ she said with a glance at Vronsky’s likeness, and **suddenly** remembered that he was the cause of her present grief. She had not called him to mind all this morning; but now, having caught sight of that manly, noble face, so familiar and dear to her, she felt an unexpected flow of love toward him.
>
> ‘But where is he? How can he leave me alone in my anguish?’ she **suddenly** thought with a sense of reproach, forgetting that she herself had hidden from him all that concerned her son. (…) And **suddenly** a strange idea crossed her mind: what if he had ceased to love her? (Maude, v.2, 118)

Edmonds uses ‘suddenly’ twice and ‘all at once’ twice:

> ‘Yes, there he is!’ she said, glancing at the portrait of Vronsky and **suddenly** remembering that he was the cause of her present misery. She had not once thought of him all the morning. But now, coming **all at once** upon that manly, noble face, so familiar and so dear to her, she felt an unexpected surge of love for him.
>
> ‘But where is he? How is it he leaves me alone in my misery?’ she thought **suddenly** with a feeling of reproach, forgetting that she herself had kept from him everything concerning her son. (…) And **all at once** a strange idea crossed her mind: what if he had ceased to love her? (Edmonds, 568)

Only Pevear uses ‘suddenly’ for all the occurrences of ‘вдруг' in the Russian text:

> 'Yes, here he is!' she said, glancing at the picture of Vronsky, and she **suddenly** remembered who had been the cause of her present grief. She had not thought of him once all morning. But now **suddenly**, seeing that noble, manly face, so familiar and dear to her, she felt an unexpected surge of love for him.
>
> 'But where is he? Why does he leave me alone with my sufferings?' she **suddenly** thought, with a feeling of reproach, forgetting that she herself had concealed from him everything to do with her son. (…) And **suddenly**

a strange thought occurred to her: what if he had stopped loving her? (Pevear, 539)

e) Tolstoy emphasises Anna’s indulgent and unreasonable jealousy of Vronsky by repeating the words ‘ревновать' [to be jealous], 'ревность' [jealousy] several times:

> … и она **ревновала**. Она **ревновала** его не к какой-нибудь женщине, а к уменьшению его любви. Не имея еще предмета для **ревности**, она отыскивала его. По малейшему намеку она переносила свою **ревность** с одного предмета на другой. То она **ревновал**а его к тем грубым женщинам, с которыми благодаря своим холостым связям он так легко мог войти в сношения; то она **ревновала** его к светским женщинам, с которыми он мог встретиться; то она **ревновала** его к воображаемой девушке, на которой он хотел, разорвав с ней связь, жениться. И эта последняя **ревность** больше всего мучила ее… […and she was jealous. She was jealous of him not because of any other woman, but of the diminution of his love. Having yet no object for jealousy, she searched for one. Following the slightest hint, she tranferred her jealousy from one object to another. Sometimes she was jealous of him in respect of those coarse women with whom thanks to his bachelor connections he could so easily start an association; sometimes she was jealous of him because of the society women that he could meet; sometimes she was jealous of him because of an imaginary girl he wanted to marry, having broken the liaison with her. And this last jealousy tormented her most of all...] (Tolstoy v.9, 355-356.)

Dole misses out the point that Anna actually has no specific object for jealousy, and eliminates the repetitions:

> …in her blind j**ealousy**, she suspected him of infidelity, and with every woman. Sometimes she **suspected** him of low *amours,* which he might enter into as an unmarried man about town: sometimes she **distrusted** ladies in society, and especially the young lady whom he would be likely to marry in case he broke with her. This **fear** had been awakened in her mind… (Dole, 696)

Maude eliminates three of the repetitions:

> She was **jealous,** not of any one woman, but of the diminution of his love. Not having as yet an object for her **jealousy**, she sought one. At the slightest hint she transferred her **jealousy** from one object to another. Now she was **jealous** of the coarse women with whom, through his bachelor connections, he might so easily have intercourse; now of the Society women whom he might meet; now of some imaginary girl whom he might marry after repudiating her. This last **jealousy** tormented her more than anything else… (Maude, v.2, 347)

Edmonds eliminates two of the repetitions:

> … she was **jealous**. She was **jealous** not of any particular woman but of his love. Not having as yet an object for her **jealousy,** she was on the look-out for one. At the slightest provocation she transferred her **jealousy** from one object to another. Now she was **jealous** of the low *amours* he might so easily enter through his bachelor connexions; now it was the society women he might meet; now she was **jealous** of some imaginary girl whom he might want to marry and for whose sake he would break with her. And this last tortured her most of all… (Edmonds, 772)

Pevear eliminates one:

> …she was **jealous.** She was **jealous** not of any one woman, but of the diminishing of his love. Having as yet no object for her **jealousy**, she was looking for one. Following the slightest hint, she transferred her **jealousy** from one object to another. Now she was **jealous** of those coarse women with whom he could so easily associate himself thanks to his bachelor connections; then she was **jealous** of the society women he might meet, or again of some imaginary girl he wanted to marry after breaking the liaison with her. And this last **jealousy** tormented her most of all... (Pevear, 740)

Only Garnett preserves all the repetitions, each time emphasising Anna's jealousy using a repetition whenever Tolstoy does it:

> …she was **jealous**. She was **jealous** not of any particular woman but of the decrease of his love. Not having got an object for her **jealousy**, she was on the lookout for it. At the slightest hint she transferred her **jealousy** from one object to another. At one time she was **jealous** of those low women with whom he might so easily renew his old bachelor ties; then she was **jealous** of the society women he might meet; then she was **jealous** of the imaginary girl whom he might want to marry, for whose sake he would break with her. And this last form of **jealousy** tortured her most of all… (Garnett, 832)

f) Different translations of the following sentence, abundant with repetitions, have already been analysed by Richard Sheldon (Sheldon 1997, 234-240):

> ‘Она была **прелестна** в своем простом черном платье, **прелестны** были ее полные руки с браслетами, **прелестна** твердая шея с ниткой жемчуга, **прелестны** вьющиеся волосы расстроившейся прически, **прелестны** грациозные легкие движения маленьких ног и рук, **прелестно** это красивое лицо в своем оживлении; но было что-то ужасное и жестокое в ее **прелести**.’ [She was enchanting in her simple black dress, enchanting were her full arms with bracelets, enchanting her firm neck with its thread of pearl, enchanting her waving hair of the disarrayed hairdo, enchanting the graceful, light movements of her small feet and hands, enchanting that beautiful face in its animation; but there was something terrible and cruel in her enchantment.] (Tolstoy v.8, 101-102)

As Sheldon says, the keystone of this sentence is the repetition of the adjective ‘прелестна’ six times, culminating in the noun ‘прелесть’. The sentence is written from Kitty’s point of view, and the isolated word enables Kitty to articulate and make sense of her experience (Sankovitch 1998, 99). The paragraph illustrates Tolstoy’s penchant for repetition and provides a succinct opportunity to judge how well the various translators have captured his style. Most translators preserve the repetition, Dole and Edmonds using the adjective ‘charming’, Garnett using ‘fascinating’ and Pevear choosing ‘enchanting’:

> She was **charming** in her simple black velvet; **charming** were her round arms, clasped by bracelets; **charming** her exquisite neck, encircled with pearls; **charming** her dark, curly locks breaking from restraint; **charming** the slow and graceful movements of her feet and hands; **charming** her lovely face, full of animation; but in all this **charm** there was something terrible and cruel. (Dole, 92)
>
> She was **fascinating** in her simple black dress, **fascinating** were her round arms with their bracelets, **fascinating** was her firm neck with its thread of pearls, **fascinating** straying curls of her loose hair, **fascinating** the graceful, light movements of her little feet and hands, **fascinating** was that lovely face in its eagerness, but there was something terrible and cruel in her **fascination.** (Garnett, 92)
>
> She was **charming** in her simple black gown, her rounded arms were **charming** with their bracelets, **charming** the firm neck with the string of pearls, **charming** the unruly curls, **charming** the graceful, easy movements of her little hands and feet, **charming** the lovely, animated face: but in that **charm** there was something terrible and cruel. (Edmonds, 97)
>
> She was **enchanting** in her simple black dress, **enchanting** were her full arms with the bracelets on them, **enchanting** her firm neck with its string of pearls, **enchanting** her curly hair in disarray, **enchanting** the graceful, light

movements of her small feet and hands, **enchanting** that beautiful face in its animation; but there was something terrible and cruel in her **enchantment**. (Pevear, 83)

Maude, however, reduces the number of adjectives in this sentence from six to two and avoids using even two identical adjectives, so he chooses one 'charming' and one 'enchanting', with the terminal noun choice being 'charm':

> She looked **charming** in her simple black dress; her full arms with the bracelets, her firm neck with the string of pearls round it, her curly hair now disarranged, every graceful movement of her small feet and hands, her handsome, animated face, - everything about her was **enchanting**, but there was something terrible and cruel in her **charm**. (Maude, v.1, 93)

Sheldon comments that the repetition makes the paragraph dynamic; without it the rest of the paragraph becomes 'an inert list' (Sheldon 1997, 235.) As far as the other translations are concerned, he points that neither the Garnett nor the Edmonds translation has any major problems (he was not able to get hold of Dole's translation). However, Sheldon believes that 'enchanting' is stronger and better able to convey the effect that Anna's charismatic presence has on Vronsky than 'fascinating' or 'charming' (Ibid. 237, 239).

g) In the episode of Kitty and Levin's meeting at the Oblonskys', discussed in 3.3, only Garnett preserves the repetition, emphasising the similarity of the characters' feelings:

'Oh, please, introduce me to Karenin' he brought out with an effort, and with a **desperately determined** step he walked into the drawing-room and beheld her.
(…) 'How long it is since we've seen each other!' and with **desperate determination** she pressed his hand with her cold hand. (Garnett, 434)

Compare with the other translators:

''*Ach!* Present me to Karenin, I beg of you,'' he succeeded in stammering, as he entered the drawing-room with the **courage of despair**.

(…) ‘‘It is a long time since we have seen each other,’’ she forced herself to say. (Dole, 393)

‘Oh, do introduce me to Karenin!’ he brought out with difficulty, and with **despairing determination** he entered the drawing-room and saw her.
(…) ‘What a long time it is since we saw one another!’ and with a **desperate resolve** her cold hand pressed his. (Maude, v.1, 433-434)

‘Oh, do introduce me to Karenin!’ he brought out with an effort, and with a **desperately determined** step he walked into the drawing-room and beheld her.
(…) ‘What a long time it is since we met!’ and with **desperate resolve** her cold hand pressed his.’ (Edmonds, 407-408.)

‘Ah, do please introduce me to Karenin,’ he barely uttered, and with a **desperately determined** step he went into the drawing room and saw her.
(…) ‘It’s so long since we’ve seen each other!’ and with **desperate resolution** pressed his hand with her cold hand. (Pevear, 382-383.)

h) Only Garnett and Pevear preserve the author’s wordplay in the sentence where Tolstoy contrasts two meanings of the word *спасение*:

(…) he clung, as to his one **salvation**, to his delusion of **salvation**. (Garnett, 579)

(…) he clung to his imaginary **salvation** as if it were **salvation** indeed. (Pevear, 511)

The other translators eliminate the repetitions:

(…) he clung to his new **convictions** as to a plank of **safety**. (Dole, 515)

(…) he clung to this mock **salvation** as if it were the **real thing**. (Maude v.2, 86)

(…) he clung to this delusion of **salvation** as if it were the **real thing**. (Edmonds, 539)

i) Dole and Garnett fail to preserve Tolstoy's wordplay with the two antonyms (see 3.3):

> Эта мелочная озабоченность Кити, столь противоположная идеалу Левина возвышенного счастия первого времени, было одно из **разочарований**; и эта милая озабоченность, которой смысла он не понимал, но не мог не любить, было одно из новых **очарований**.

Другое **разочарование** и **очарование** были ссоры. [This petty preoccupation of Kitty, so opposite to Levin's ideal of the exalted happiness of the first period, was one of disenchantments; and this sweet preoccupation whose meaning he did not understand but could not help loving, was one of new enchantments.
Another disenchantment and enchantment were quarrels.] (Tolstoy v.9, 58)

This zeal for trifles, so entirely opposed to Levin's lofty ideal of happiness, seemed to him one of his **lost illusions**, while this same activity, the meaning of which escaped him, but which he could not see without pleasure, seemed to him a new **delight**.
The quarrels were also a surprise. (Dole, 485-486.)

This care for domestic details in Kitty, so opposed to Levin's ideal of exhalted happiness, was at first one of the **disappointments**; and this sweet care of her household, the aim of which he did not understand, but could not help loving, was one of the new **happy surprises**.
Another **disappointment** and **happy surprise** came in their quarrels. (Garnett, 544)

Kitty's absorption in these trifles, quite contrary to Levin's early ideal of lofty happiness, was one of his **disappointments**; yet that sweet absorption, the meaning of which he could not understand but which he could not help liking, was also one of his new **enchantments**. Another **disenchantment** and new **enchantment** was afforded by their quarrels. (Maude v.2, 51)

Kitty's zeal for trifles, so opposed to Levin's early ideal of lofty happiness, was one of his **disappointments**; and this sweet activity, the meaning of which he could not understand but which he could not help loving, was one of his new **enchantments**.
Their quarrels, too, afforded both **disenchantment** and new **enchantment**. (Edmonds, 507)

This trifling preoccupation of Kitty's, so opposite to Levin's ideal of the exhalted happiness, was one of his **disenchantments**; yet this sweet preoccupation, the meaning of which he did not understand but which he could not help loving, was one of his new **enchantments**.
The quarrels were another **disenchantment** and **enchantment**. (Pevear, 481)

j) In the paragraph, also discussed in 4.3, where Tolstoy repeats groups of words in adjacent sentences, when the first one introduces a specific situation and the second one repeats it and explains its reason, most translators preserve the repetition, with the exception of Maude and Dole:

(…) he was in an **agony of embarrassment**. This **agony of embarrassment** was due to the fact that (…) (Garnett, 373.)

(…) **he was in an agony of embarrassment. He was in an agony of embarrassment** because (…) (Edmonds, 352.)

(…) **he felt painfully awkward. He felt painfully awkward because** (…) (Pevear, 328.)

Compare it with Maude (Dole simply omits this part of the paragraph):

(…) he felt **painfully uncomfortable**. This **painful discomfort** was due to the fact that (…) (Maude v.1, 373.)

k) Some of Tolstoy's repetitions are eliminated by all the five translators. For instance:

Остававшийся в **углу уголок** был смахнут в пять минут. [A little corner left in the corner was wiped off in five minutes.] (Tolstoy v.8, 300)

The triangle was finished in five minutes. (Dole, 267)

The little piece left uncut in the corner was mown in five minutes. (Garnett, 289)

The small patch that was left in the last corner was mown in five minutes. (Maude v.1, 289)

The little patch left in the corner was whisked off in five minutes. (Edmonds, 276)

A little patch left in the corner was cleared in five minutes. (Pevear, 255.)

Or:

l) Лицо это было **страшно** от изнеможденияи **страха**. [This face was frightful because of exhaustion and fright.] (Tolstoy v.9, 267)

His face wore an agitated expression of fright and weakness. (Dole, 630)

His face was dreadful-looking from exhaustion and dismay. (Garnett, 747)

His face was dreadful from its expression of exhaustion and fear. (Maude v.2, 260)

The look of dismay and exhaustion on his face was dreadful to behold. (Edmonds, 694)

Exhaustion and fear gave this face a dreadful look. (Pevear, 662)

To sum up, one can perhaps say that Maude attempts to ‘improve’ Tolstoy’s text by eliminating his repetitions more than any other translator does. On the whole, Pevear preserves the most repetitions[xxxv] ‘as evidence of the freedom Tolstoy allows himself in Russian’ (Pevear and Volokhonsky 2001, xvii). However, some of the repetitions particularly important for Tolstoy’s narration (like those emphasising the similarity of Kitty and Levin’s feelings or the scope of Anna’s jealousy) can be occasionally lost in Pevear’s translation and best preserved by Garnett.

5.6. <u>Conjunction *u* (and): its use and repetition.</u> Tolstoy uses conjunction *u* repetitively in order to connect statements that serve to strengthen a point, like in the sentence below:

a) 'Были **и** рысаки, **и** блины, **и** медвежьи охоты, **и** тройки, **и** цыгане, **и** кутежи с русским битьем посуды.' [There were both race-horses and pancakes, and bear hunts, and troikas, and gypsies, and carousals with the Russian smashing of crockery.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 415.)

The repetitions of the conjunction ‘и' emphasise the variety of the 'Russian pleasures' experienced by the sybarite foreign prince, who insisted on experiencing them all. These six repetitions are reduced to only one ‘and’ in Dole's translation:

'There were races, *blinui,* or carnival cakes, bear-hunts, *troika* parties, gypsies, **and** feasts set forth with Russian dishes…' (Dole, 370)

There are two ‘and’ in Maude's translation:

'(…) trotting-races, pancakes, bear-hunting, **and** drives in three-horse sledges, gipsies, **and** Russian sprees with smashing of crockery.' (Maude, v.1, 402)

Edmonds preserves four 'and':

'(…) trotting-races **and** pancakes, bear-hunts **and** troikas **and** gypsies **and** carousals with the Russian accompaniment of breaking glasses' (Edmonds, 379)

Garnett and Pevear preserve five 'and' out of six:

'They had race-horses, **and** Russian pancakes **and** bear-hunts **and** three-horse sledges, **and** gypsies **and** drinking feasts, with the Russian accompaniment of broken crockery.' (Garnett, 402)

'There were trotting races, **and** pancakes, **and** bear hunts, **and** troikas, **and** gypsies, **and** carousing with a Russian smashing of crockery.' (Pevear, 354.)

These repetitions allow to preserve the oral excitement of the original narration as well as Vronsky's irritation with the prince's desire to taste all the Russian pleasures. The repetition of the conjunction *u* also emphasises Vronsky's contempt for the prince in the next sentence:

b) 'Это был очень глупый, **и** очень самоуверенный, **и** очень здоровый, **и** очень чистоплотный человек, **и** больше ничего.' [It was a very stupid and very self-confident and very healthy and very cleanly man, and nothing more.] (Tolstoy, v. 8, 416.)

Most translators eliminate the repetitions, toning the sentence down:

> 'The image that he saw there was that of a very stupid, very self-confident, very healthy, fastidious man…' (Dole, 370)
>
> 'The Prince was a very stupid, very healthy **and** very cleanly man – **and** nothing more.' (Maude, v.1, 403)
>
> ‘The prince was a very stupid, very self-satisfied, very healthy **and** immaculate man, **and** nothing else.’ (Edmonds, 379.)
>
> 'This was a very stupid, very self-confident, very healthy **and** very cleanly man, **and** nothing more.' (Pevear, 355)

Only Garnett preserves all the repetitions of 'и' and achieves the effect similar to the effect of the Russian text:

> 'He was a very stupid **and** very self-satisfied **and** very healthy **and** very well-washed man, **and** nothing else.' (Garnett, 403.)

c) In the next example Garnett’s use of the conjunction ‘and’ matches Tolstoy’s style better than the other translations do:

> ‘Бессильно опустив руки на одеяло, необычайно прекрасная и тихая, она безмолвно смотрела на него **и** хотела **и** не могла улыбнуться.’ [Powerlessly laying her (hands? arms) on the blanket, unusually beautiful and quiet, she was silently looking at him and wanted to and could not smile.] (Tolstoy, v.9, 327)
>
> ‘(…) she looked at him, as she lay there, beautiful with a supernatural beauty, and tried to smile at him, one hand resting on the counterpane.’ (Dole, 675)
>
> ‘With her hands hanging exhausted on the quilt, looking extraordinary lovely and serene, she looked at him in silence and tried to smile, **and** could not.’ (Garnett, 805)
>
> ‘With her arms helplessly outstretched upon the quilt, unusually beautiful and calm, she lay, gazing silently at him, trying unsuccessfully to smile.’ (Maude, v.2, 320)
>
> ‘With her arms feebly stretched out on the counterpane, she lay gazing silently at him, looking extraordinarily lovely and serene, trying unsuccessfully to smile.’ (Edmonds, 748)

> ‘Her arms resting strengthlessly on the blanket, remarkably beautiful and quiet, she silently looked at him and tried **but** was unable to smile.’ (Pevear, 715)

Translations of this sentence differ from each other substantionally. To begin with, the Russian word *руки* means both ‘hands’ and ‘arms’, and in this particular context both choices seem acceptable, but Dole replaces the two hands with ‘one hand’. Maude and Edmonds change the predicate of the sentence from ‘silently looked’ (‘was looking’) to ‘she lay, gazing silently’ and then add the awkward word ‘unsuccessfully’. Pevear creates a strange word ‘strengthlessly’ and replaces the second ‘и’ with ‘but’. Yet Tolstoy creates a picture where Kitty’s silent gaze and her desire and inability to smile complement rather than contradict each other – Tolstoy could have used *но* (but), yet chose to write ‘and’. Only Garnett uses the conjunction ‘and’ three times, putting it in the same places where ‘и’ is used in the Russian text.

A similar use of the conjunction ‘и’ is in the following sentence:

> К этому еще присоединилось присутствие в тридцати верстах от него Кити Щербацкой, которую он хотел **и** не мог видеть. [To this was also joined the presence in thirty versts from him of Kitty Shcherbatskaya whom he wanted to and could not see.] (Tolstoy v.8, 379)

Again, in this sentence both Levin’s desire to see Kitty and his inability to see her add to his unhappiness, not contradicting each other, this is why Tolstoy chose ‘и' (and) rather than 'но' (but).

Dole omits the last part of the sentence:

Besides this, Kitty Sherbatskaia was within twenty miles of him. (Dole, 340)

Maude and Edmonds use the conjunction ‘yet’ rather than ‘and’:

> Added to this there was Kitty Shcherbatskaya not more than twenty miles away, and he wanted to meet her, **yet** could not. (Maude v.1, 365)

> Added to this there was the presence, not twenty miles off, of Kitty Shcherbatsky, whom he longed to see, **yet** could not. (Edmonds, 345)

Only Garnett and Pevear use the connector ‘and’:

> To this now was joined the presence, only twenty-five miles off, of Kitty Shtcherbatsky, whom he longed to see **and** could not see. (Garnett, 366)
>
> To this was added the presence some twenty miles away of Kitty Scherbatsky, whom he wanted to see **and** could not. (Pevear, 322)

5.7. Repetition of verbs defining speech acts. Verbs defining speech acts present an important object for comparing translation strategies on different levels: they are a part of the author’s style and in the same time define the way the characters of a novel communicate between themselves. Languages, too, differ in the variety and repetition of verbs they use in a description of a dialogue. Tolstoy uses different verbs to describe verbal acts characteristic of certain situations – or certain characters. As shown in 4.4, Tolstoy employs the verb *заговорить* ‘to start speaking’ to show outbursts of passionate heated speech, full of repetitions, characteristic of Kitty. Translating the dialogue between her and Levin quoted in 4.4, Tolstoy’s translators often replace *заговорить* with a neutral ‘to say’*:*

> ‘‘I tell you, if you go, I am going too. I shall certainly go with you,’’ **said** she with angry determination. ‘‘I should like to know why it would be impossible. Why did you say that ?’’
> ‘‘Because God knows when or in what place I shall find him, or by what means I shall reach him. You would only hinder me,’’ said he, doing his best to retain his self-control.
> (…)
> ‘‘You *always* ascribe to me that I have such miserable sentiments,’’ she **cried**, choking with tears of vexation. ‘‘I am not so weak… I know that it is my duty to be with my husband when he is in sorrow, and you want to wound me on purpose. You don’t want to take me’’ –
> ‘‘No! this is frightful! to be such a slave !’’ cried Levin, rising from the table, no longer able to hide his anger ; at the same instant he perceived that he was making himself suffer.
> ‘‘Why, then, did you get married ? You might have been free. Why – if you repent already ?’’ – and Kitty fled from the room. (Dole, 492.)

Garnett uses ‘to say’ for all the occurrences of ‘заговорить' in that episode:

‘I tell you, that if you go, I shall come with you ; I shall certainly come,’ she **said** hastily and wrathfully. ‘Why out of the question ? Why do you say it’s out of the question ?’
‘Because it’ll be going God knows where, by all sorts of roads and to all sorts of hotels. You would be a hindrance to me,’ said Levin, trying to be cool.
(…)
‘There, you always ascribe base, vile motives to me,’ she **said** with tears of wounded pride and fury. ‘I didn’t mean, it wasn’t weakness, it wasn’t…. I feel that it’s my duty to be with my husband when he’s in trouble, but you try on purpose to hurt me, you try on purpose not to understand….’
‘No ; this is awful ! To be such a slave !’ cried Levin, getting up, and unable to restrain his anger any longer. But at the same second he felt that he was beating himself.
‘Then why did you marry ? You could have been free. Why did you, if you regret it ?’ she **said**, getting up and running away into the drawing-room. (Garnett, 552.)

The other translators attempt to find an equivalent for the second occurrence of ‘заговорить', different from ‘say’ (‘begin’ in Maude's and Pevear's translations, ‘burst out’ in Edmonds' translation) and translate the first and the third occurrences as ‘said’.

Tolstoy uses the verb *подтвердить* 'to confirm, to voice agreement' in order to indicate a speaker's agreement with a previous utterance.

'– Нет, вы поймите, мама, почему для него и для нее лучше ничего придумать. Первое – она прелесть! – сказала Кити, загнув один палец.
- Она очень нравится ему, это верно, - **подтвердила** Долли.
- Потом он такое занимает положение в свете, что ему ни состояние, ни положение в свете его жены совершенно не нужны. Ему нужно одно – хорошую, милую жену, спокойную.
- Да, уж с ней можно быть спокойным, - **подтвердила** Долли.' [- No, you understand, mother, why there is nothing better to think of for him and for her. First thing, she is lovely! – said Kitty, bending one finger.
  - He likes her very much, it’s true, - assented Dolly.
  - Then, he occupies such a position in society that he absolutely doesn’t need his wife’s fortune or position in the society. He needs one thing – a good, nice, calm wife.
- Yes, with her one can be calm, - assented Dolly.] (Tolstoy v.9, 144.)

Most of this dialogue is omitted in Dole’s translation. Garnett translates ‘подтвердила' as 'assented', and Pevear as 'confirmed'. Edmonds, in order to avoid the repetition, translates the first occurrence of 'подтвердила' in this example as 'assented' and the second one as 'put in again'. Maude translates both occurrences as 'chimed in', but,

they, too, add the word 'again', describing Dolly's second utterance – as if wanting to compensate for Tolstoy's repetition of the same verb:

> ''He certainly likes her very much,' Dolly **chimed in**.
> (…)
> 'Yes, one certainly can trust her,' **again chimed in** Dolly.' (Maude v.2, 137)

The dialogue between Anna and Dolly, also quoted in chapter 4, gets quite emotional, which leads them to start interrupting each other (as it sometimes happens in real life):

> - О нет! – быстро **перебила** Анна. – Он жалок, он убит раскаяньем…
> - Способен ли он к раскаянью? – **перебил**а Долли, внимательно вглядываясь в лицо золовки.
> - Да, я его знаю. Я не могла без жалости смотреть на него. Мы его обе знаем. Он добр, но он горд, а теперь так унижен. Главное, что меня тронуло (и тут Анна угадала главное, что могло тронуть Долли) – его мучают две вещи: то, что ему стыдно детей, и то, что он, любя тебя… да, да, любя больше всего на свете, - поспешно **перебила** она хотевшую возражать Долли, - сделал тебе больно, убил тебя.
> [- Oh no! – quickly interrupted Anna. – He is pitiful, he is killed by repentance…
> - Is he capable of repentance? – interrupted Dolly, looking into her sister-in-law's face attentively.
> - Yes, I know him. I could not look at him without pity. We both know him. He is kind, but he is proud, and now so humiliated. The main thing that touched me (and here Anna guessed the main thing that could touch Dolly) – two things torture him: that he is ashamed of the children, and that he, loving you… yes, yes, loving more than anything in the world, - she hurriedly interrupted Dolly who wanted to object, - made you hurt, killed you.] (Tolstoy v.8, 85.)

Not all the translators preserve the three repetitions of 'перебила'. Dole translates them as 'interrupted', 'demanded' and 'added'; Garnett as 'interposed', 'interrupted' and 'interrupted'; Maude as 'interrupted', 'interrupted' and 'went on, not listening to'; Edmonds as 'interrupted', 'broke in' and 'went on, to prevent … from objecting'. Only Pevear translates 'перебила' as 'interrupted' every time.

By changing a verb of denoting speech act translators can to some extent distort the narrative. In the description of the quarrel between Levin and Kitty all the three occurrences of the verb *заговорить* are used in the situation where Kitty does not quite finish her utterances – the first two are interrupted by Levin's counter-arguments, during the third one she bursts into tears and runs away, and the verb

заговорить seems appropriate for a very heated conversation. The English verb 'said' makes the dialogue come across as less heated.

On the whole, Garnett and Pevear follow Tolstoy's choice of the verbs denoting speech acts more closely than the other translators do.

5.8. Verbs describing action in progress.

Tolstoy, as Gareth Williams suggests, had this ability 'to so fix his attention on a moment in the past that this moment reveals its identity and becomes not just a chain of events but a living picture which is present to the reader and becomes the reader's universe' (Williams 1990, 1-2). For instance, early in the novel, Vronsky meets Anna at a social gathering :

> 'У входной двери послышались шаги, и княгиня Бетси, зная, что это Каренина, взглянула на Вронского. Он **смотрел** на дверь, и лицо его имело странное новое выражение. Он радостно, пристально и вместе робко **смотрел** на входившую и медленно **приподнимался.** В гостиную **входила** Анна. Как всегда держась чрезвычайно прямо и не изменяя направления взгляда, она сделала своим быстрым, твердым и легким шагом, отличавшим ее от походки других светских женщин, те несколько шагов, которые отделяли ее от хозяйки, пожала ей руку, улыбнулась и с этою улыбкой оглянулась на Вронского. Вронский низко поклонился и подвинул ей стул.' [At the entrance door steps were heard, and Princess Betsy, knowing that it was Karenina, glanced at Vronsky. He was looking at the door, and his face had a strange new expression. He joyfully, intently, and at the same time timidly was looking at the entering woman and slowly lifting himself up. Anna was entering the drawing room. As always holding herself extremely straight and not changing the direction of her gaze, she took, with her quick, firm and light step, which distinguished her from other society women, those few steps that were separating her from the hostess, pressed her hand, smiled, and with that smile turned round to Vronsky. Vronsky made a low bow and moved a chair for her.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 163)

The imperfective aspect of the verbs 'вставал', 'смотрел', 'входила' and 'приподнимался' means action in progress[xxxvi], therefore they should be translated into English in the past continuous. The English simple past tense, depicting completed actions succeeding each other in narrative, is normally expressed by the Russian verbs in the

perfective aspect (Borras and Christian 1977, 125). However, most translators translate most verbs of this paragraph into English simple past tense:

> Steps were heard near the door, and Betsy, convinced that she should see Anna appear, looked at Vronsky. He also **looked** in the direction of the door, and his face had a strange expression of joy, expectation, and almost of fear, and he **rose** slightly from his chair. Anna **came** into the drawing-room. She crossed the short distance between her and the mistress of the mansion, with that rapid, light, but decided step, which distinguished her from all the other women of this circle. As usual, she stood extremely upright, and, with her eyes fixed on Betsy, went directly towards her, and shook hands with a smile, and with the same smiled glanced at Vronsky. The latter bowed profoundly, and offered her a chair. (Dole, 148)
>
> Steps were heard at the door, and Princess Betsy, knowing it was Madame Karenin, glanced at Vronsky. He **was looking** towards the door, and his face wore a strange, new expression. Joyfully, intently, and at the same time timidly, he **gazed** at the approaching figure, and slowly he **rose** to his feet. Anna **walked** into the drawing-room. Holding herself extremely erect, as always, looking straight before her, and moving with her swift, resolute, and light step, that distinguished her from all other society women, she crossed the short space to her hostess, shook hands with her, smiled, and with the same smile looked round at Vronsky. Vronsky bowed low and pushed a chair up for her. (Garnett, 154.)
>
> Steps were heard at the entrance, and Princess Betsy, knowing that it was Anna, glanced at Vronsky. He **was looking** at the door with a strange new expression on his face. He **gazed** joyfully, intently, and timidly at the lady who was entering, and slowly **rose** from his seat. Anna **entered** the room holding herself, as usual, very erect, and without changing the direction of her eyes, approached her hostess, walking with that quick, firm yet light step which distinguished her from other Society women. She shook hands, smilingly, and with the same smile looked round at Vronsky. He bowed low and moved a chair toward her. (Maude, v.1, 154.)
>
> Steps were heard outside the door and the Princess Betsy, knowing it was Madame Karenin, glanced at Vronsky. He **was looking** towards the door with a strange new expression on his face. Joyfully, intently, and at the same time timidly, he **gazed** at the approaching figure and slowly **rose** to his feet. Anna **walked** into the drawing-room. Holding herself very erect as usual and looking straight before her, she came up to her hostess, moving with the quick, firm, yet light step which distinguished her from other society women. She shook hands, smiled, and with the same smile looked round at Vronsky. Vronsky gave a low bow and pushed a chair forward for her. (Edmonds, 153.)

Pevear, in his version, employs more continuous tense and thus creates a more dynamic picture of the events:

> Steps were heard at the door, and Princess Betsy, knowing that it was Anna, glanced at Vronsky. He **was looking** at the door, and his face had a strange new expression. He **was looking** joyfully, intently, and at the same time timidly at the entering woman and slowly **getting up** from his seat. Anna **was entering** the drawing room. Holding herself extremely straight as always, with her quick, firm and light step, which distinguished her from other society women, and not changing the direction of her gaze, she took the few steps that separated her from the hostess, pressed her hand, smiled, and with that smile turned round to Vronsky. Vronsky made a low bow and moved a chair for her. (Pevear, 137.)

Pevear comments that the simultaneous movement of the two characters in relation to each other is beautifully expressed in Russian by the sequence of verbs describing action in progress. 'Of course, Tolstoy was not striving for any special stylistic effect; he simply saw it that way, and so did we when we translated it; only afterwards did we recognize the rightness of it' (Pevear 2000, vi.)

5.9. <u>Ambiguities through changing point of view.</u>

As it was pointed out in 4.8, the following paragraph could be easily misinterpreted:

> 'Когда она вышла в гостиную, не он, а Яшвин встретил ее взглядом. **Он** рассматривал карточки ее сына, которые она забыла на столе, и не торопился взглянуть на нее.' [When she came out into the living room, it was not him but Yashvin who met her eyes. He was looking at the pictures of her son that she had left on the table, and did not hurry to look at her.] (Tolstoy, v.9, 127)

It is not immediately clear to whom 'он' (he) refers in the second sentence of this paragraph – Vronsky or Yashvin. Dole therefore makes an understandable mistake translating the text thus:

> 'When she returned to the drawing-room, she did not see Vronsky but Yashvin, **who** was looking at the portraits of Serozha, which she had left lying on the table.' (Dole, 542)

Knowing Tolstoy's style, the use of the pronoun 'он' is perfectly justifiable here, since the paragraph is written from Anna's point of view. However, all the translators[xxxvii] who realise that 'он' in the second sentence refers to Vronsky, feel compelled to clarify Tolstoy's text and to translate 'он' as 'Vronsky'. By doing so they seem to apply that it was Tolstoy's carelessness that made him choose to say 'он' instead of 'Vronsky'. In reality, by replacing 'он' with Vronsky translators change the whole sentence from something observed and experienced by Anna to a simple description by an impartial narrator. Following Berman, one can say that this 'overtranslation' renders the text more "clear", but could obscure 'its own mode of clarity' (Berman 2000, 290), i.e. its own logic.

> When she went into the drawing-room it was not he, but Yashvin, who met her eyes. **Vronsky** was looking through the photographs of her son, which she had forgotten on the table, and he made no haste to look round at her. (Garnett, 611)

> 'When she entered the drawing-room not his eyes but Yashvin's met hers. **Vronsky** was examining her son's photos which she had forgotten on the table, and did not hurry to look at her.' (Maude, v.2, 119)

> 'When she went into the drawing-room, it was not he, but Yashvin, who met her eyes. **Vronsky** was looking through the photographs of her son, which she had forgotten on the table, and did not hurry to turn round.' (Edmonds, 568-569.)

> When she came out to the drawing room, it was not his but Yashvin's eyes that met hers. **Vronsky** was looking at the photographs of her son, which she had forgotten on the table, and was in no hurry to look at her. (Pevear, 540)

This is probably one of those situations where Pevear and Volokhonsky decide that some 'correcting' (Pevear's word) of the original is inevitable (Pevear 2000, vi).

If one looks at the example already quoted in 6.2 – when Vronsky comes to see Anna while she is waiting for her son to come home from his walk, a similar confusion with personal pronouns is possible:

> 'На этот раз Сережи не было дома, и она была совершенно одна и **сидела** на террасе, ожидая возвращения сына, ушедшего гулять и застигнутого дождем. Она послала человека и девушку искать его и **сидела** ожидая. Одетая в белое с широким шитьем платье, она **сидела** в углу террасы за цветами и не слыхала его.' [This time Seryozha was not at home, and she was completely alone and sat on the terrace, waiting for the return of her son, gone for a walk and caught in the rain. She had sent a manservant and a maid to look for him and sat waiting. Wearing a white dress with broad embroidery, she sat in the corner of the terrace behind the flowers and did not hear him.]
> (Tolstoy, v.8, 220)

The first two sentences of this paragraph refer to Anna and her son; Vronsky is not even mentioned in those two sentences. Nevertheless, 'его' (him) in the third sentence of the paragraph refers to Vronsky and not to Seryozha, since the narrator's focus immediately switches to Vronsky who admires Anna's beauty while she is unaware of his presence. In this situation of free indirect speech only two of the translators (Dole and Maude) choose to clarify Tolstoy's text and substitute 'did not hear him' for 'did not hear Vronsky's step' (Dole) or 'did not hear Vronsky coming' (Maude).

In another example of Tolstoy's free indirect speech Edmonds clarifies the text more than the other translators do:

> Княгиня была то с доктором в спальне, то в кабинете, где очутился накрытый стол; то не **она** была, а была Долли. Потом Левин помнил, что его посылали куда-то. Раз его послали перенести стол и диван. Он с усердием сделал это, думая, что это для **нее** нужно, и потом только он узнал, что это он для себя готовил ночлег. [The princess was now with the doctor in the bedroom, now in the study, where a laid table happened to be; now it was not she but was Dolly. Then Levin remembered that he had been sent somewhere. Once he was sent to move a table and a sofa. He did it with diligence, thinking that it was needed for her, and only then learnt that he had been preparing a night rest for himself.] (Tolstoy, v.9, 324)

This passage could be seen as confusing as throughout the passage Levin thinks of Kitty as *она* (she), yet 'она' in the first sentence of the example refers to the old princess. Edmonds clarifies both occurrences of the pronoun 'она' in this passage:

The princess was one moment in the bedroom with the doctor, and the next in the study where a table laid for a meal suddenly appeared; then it was not **the princess**, but Dolly. Afterwards Levin remembered that he had been sent somewhere. Once he was asked to move a table and a couch. He did it with alacrity, imagining that it was something for **Kitty,** and only later discovered that he had been preparing his own bed for the night. (Edmonds, 745)

Maude clarifies one occurrence of 'она' in this passage:

The Princess was one moment in the bedroom with the doctor, and the next in the study, where a table laid for a meal had made its appearance; and next it was not **the Princess**, but Dolly. Afterwards Levin remembered being sent somewhere. Once he was told to fetch a table and a sofa. He did it with zeal, believing that it was necessary for **her** sake, and only later discovered that he had been preparing a sleeping-place for himself. (Maude, v.2, 316-317)

The other translators translate 'она' and 'нее' in this passage as 'she' and 'her' respectively. To sum up, Pevear over-clarifies less than the other translators do; the Maudes and Edmonds tend to over-clarify more than the other translators do.

5.10. Metonymic sentences. Tolstoy's writing is characterised by metonymic sentences where the characters' eyes, voices, etc. seem to have a life of their own, such as *ее глаза взглянули* 'her eyes looked', *ее голос сказал* 'her voice said'. Tolstoy usually describes things only as reflected in the mind of one of his characters (Maude 1929, 426), and those sentences usually depict the events from the point of view of the recipient, the person who notices the other person's glance or hears the other person's voice. As a result, readers, too, respond to the characters' smiles, the pressure of their hands, just as characters in the book do (Jones 1978, 89). Those sentences are occasionally changed by his translators who change the constructions to either 'X looked' or 'Y noticed X's eyes'. Below are some examples of such sentences:

a) '…чьи-то **руки** снизу **обняли** ее шею. Кити на коленях стояла пред ней' […someone's arms embraced her neck from below. Kitty was standing on her knees in front of her.] (Tolstoy v.8, 149.)

'… two arms were thrown around her neck. Kitty was on her knees before her.' (Dole, 136)

'…**she (…) felt arms** around her neck. Kitty was on her knees in front of her' (Garnett, 140.)

'**A pair of arms encircled** her neck from below and Kitty was kneeling before her.' (Maude v.1, 141)

'**Two arms encircled** her neck from below, and Kitty was kneeling before her.' (Edmonds, 140)

'…someone's **arms encircled** her neck from below. Kitty was kneeling before her.' (Pevear, 125.)

b) 'Светлая и задумчивая, вся исполненная изящной и сложной внутренней, чуждой Левину жизни, она смотрела через него на зарю восхода. В то самое мгновенье, как виденье это уж исчезало, правдивые **глаза взглянули** на него.' [Light and thoughtful, all filled with a graceful and complex inner, alien to Levin, life she was looking through him at the dawn of the sunrise. At the very instant when this vision was about to vanish, the truthful eyes looked at him.] (Tolstoy v.8, 325.)

'…**he caught a glimpse of her** frank **eyes**.' (Dole, 291)

'…the truthful **eyes glanced** at him.' (Garnett, 314)

'…her candid **eyes fell** on him.' (Maude v.1, 315)

'…the candid **eyes fell** on him.' (Edmonds, 299)

'…the truthful **eyes looked** at him.' (Pevear, 277.)

c) ' -А, ты не ушел? – **сказал** вдруг **голос** Кити…' ['Oh, you haven't gone?' – suddenly said Kitty's voice.] (Tolstoy v.9, 444.)

'"Haven't you gone in yet?" **said** Kitty's **voice** suddenly.' (Dole, 768)

''Oh, you haven't gone in then?' **he heard** Kitty's **voice** all at once.' (Garnett, 918)

''Oh, you've not gone?' suddenly **asked Kitty**…' (Maude v.9, 437)

‘‘Oh, you haven’t gone in yet?’ **he** suddenly **heard** Kitty’s **voice**…’ (Edmonds, 852)

‘‘Ah, you haven’t gone?’ the **voice** of Kitty suddenly **said**.’ (Pevear, 816)

d) ‘– Я все-таки с вами не согласна, - **говорил голос** дамы.’ [‘I still do not agree with you,’ – the lady’s voice was saying.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 77.)

‘‘However, I don’t agree with you,’’ **said the voice**.’ (Dole, 70)

‘‘All the same I don’t agree with you,’ **said the** lady’s **voice**.’ (Garnett, 69)

‘‘All the same I don’t agree with you,’ **the lady was saying**.’ (Maude, v.1, 69)

‘‘All the same I don’t agree with you,’ **said the** lady’s **voice**.’ (Edmonds, 75)

‘‘I still don’t agree with you,’ the lady’s **voice said**.’ (Pevear, 62)

In example a) the construction is changed in Garnett’s translation where she changes the narrative focus from Kitty to Dolly and therefore makes the reader focus on Dolly’s feelings for longer than Tolstoy’s reader does. Dole changes the construction in example b) to Levin’s point of view and therefore misses the moment where Kitty sees Levin and includes him in her inner life – to which a minute before that he was stranger. Only Dole and Pevear keep Tolstoy’s construction intact in example c). When Maude changes ‘said Kitty’s voice’ for ‘asked Kitty’, he destroys the narrative effect that shows Levin so absorbed in his thoughts that he does not notice Kitty at the terrace until she starts speaking to him. Similarly, in example d) Maude does not preserve the effect of Vronsky hearing Anna’s voice but not being able to see her. He consistently changes the construction in these two sentences, not attempting equivalence with Tolstoy’s style.

5.11. Compound sentences: coexistence of different events in the same period.

May has commented on the fact that English translators often show insensitivity to the boundaries of sentences in Russian prose, arbitrarily cutting up long sentences. As she writes, the shortening of syntactic units in translation implies that translators try to introduce as little new information at each stage as possible, 'so that the connection between topic and focus is always optimally explicit'. (May 1994, 121; 129)

In the following, rather lengthy, paragraph Tolstoy uses several sentences to build the reader's anticipation and then resolves it in one compound sentence:

> (…) Между тем, слушая обычный доклад, он имел самый невинный, безобидный вид. Никто не думал, глядя на его белые с напухшими жилами руки, так нежно длинными пальцами ощупывавшие оба края лежавшего пред ним листа белой бумаги, и на его с выражением усталости набок склоненную голову, что сейчас из его уст выльются такие речи, которые произведут страшную бурю, заставят членов кричать, перебивая друг друга, и председателя требовать соблюдения порядка. Когда доклад кончился, Алексей Александрович своим тихим тонким голосом объявил, что он имеет сообщить некоторые свои соображения по делу об устройстве инородцев. Внимание обратилось на него. Алексей Александрович откашлялся и, не глядя на своего противника, но избрав, как он всегда это делал при произнесении речей, первое сидевшее пред ним лицо – маленького смирного старичка, не имевшего никогда никакого мнения в комиссии, начал излагать свои соображения. Когда дело дошло до коренного и органического закона, противник вскочил и начал возражать. Стремов, тоже член комиссии и тоже задетый за живое, стал оправдываться, - и вообще произошло бурное заседание; но Алексей Александрович восторжествовал, и его предложение было принято; были назначены три новые комиссии, и на другой день в известном петербургском кругу только и было речи, что об этом заседании. [Meanwhile, listening to a usual report, he had the most innocent, harmless look. Nobody thought, looking at his white with swollen veins hands, so tenderly with long fingers touching both edges of the sheet of white paper lying in front of him and at his head bowed to one side with an expression of tiredness, that now from his mouth such speeches would pour out which would produce a frightful storm, make the members shout, interrupting each other and the chairman demand order. When the report finished, Alexey Alexandrovich with his quiet thin voice announced that he had to tell some of his considerations on the subject of the settlement of people of different origins. Attention was turned to him. Alexey Alexandrovich cleared his throat and, not looking at his opponent but having chosen, as he always did by pronouncing speeches, the first person sitting in front of him – a small peaceful old man who never had any opinion in the commission, began to expound his considerations. When the subject reached the fundamental and organic law, the opponent jumped up and began to object. Stremov, also a member of the commission and also stung to the quick, began to justify himself – and altogether a stormy meeting happened; but Alexey Alexandrovich triumphed, and his suggestion was accepted; three new commissions were appointed, and the next day in a certain Petersburg circle there was no other talk than of this meeting.] (Tolstoy v.8, 373-374)

Dole and Edmonds split this last sentence in three; Maude splits it in two. For instance:

> Stremov, who was also a member of the Commission, and also stung to the quick, began defending himself, and altogether a stormy sitting followed. But Karenin won the day, and his motion was carried. Three new commissions were appointed, and on the morrow in a certain Petersburg circle nothing else was talked of but this sitting. (Edmonds, 341)

By breaking the sentence translators possibly make the text clearer but defeat Tolstoy's purpose in constructing such a complex sentence, probably to reflect Karenin's instant success after such cunning preparation[xxxviii]. Garnett and Pevear preserve the sentence as one.

Sometimes Maude also combines Tolstoy's two paragraphs into one paragraph (see 5.5, example (i).

5.12. 'Compression' of the language. As quoted from his letter in chapter 4, Tolstoy strove to make his language more concise and compressed, similar to the language of peasants. For instance, this is how he would start a chapter: 'В Суровский уезд не было ни железной, ни почтовой дороги, и Левин ехал на своих в тарантасе.

На половине дороги он остановился кормить у богатого мужика.' [There was neither a rail or post road to the Surovsky district, and Levin was riding his own (horses) in the tarantass. Half-way he stopped to feed at a wealthy muzhik's.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 380)

It is his horses that Levin stops to feed half way. Such a use of the verb *кормить* [to feed] without an object is rare in Russian, but Tolstoy uses it as a stylistic device, adapting compressed, peasant-like narrative style (see 4.13).

Dole misunderstands the Russian text:

In the district of Surof there are neither railways nor post-roads; and Levin took his own horses, and went in a *tarantas* [travelling-carriage].

When he was half way, he stopped **to get a meal** at the house of a rich *muzhik.* (Dole, 341)

Most other translators clarify the Russian text, adding that it was the horses Levin stopped to feed:

> In the Surovsky district there was no railway nor service of post-horses, and Levin drove there with his own horses, in his big, old-fashioned carriage.
> He stopped half-way at a well-to-do peasant's **to feed his horses**. (Garnett, 367)

> There was no railway or stage-coach to the Surovsky district, and Levin went in his own *tarantas.*
> Half-way he stopped **to feed his horses** at a well-to-do peasant's house. (Maude, v.1, 367)

> There was no railway or service of post-horses in the Surovsky district, so Levin drove there with own horses in his *tarantas,* a large four-wheeled vehicle with leather top.
> He stopped half-way at a well-to-do peasant's **to feed his horses**.

Pevear's translation creates an ambiguity – did Levin stop to feed his horses or to have a meal:

> There was no railway or post road to the Surov district, and Levin drove there with his own horses in the tarantass.
> Half-way there he stopped **for feeding** at a wealthy muzhik's. (Pevear, 323)

Pevear's translation matches the formal qualities of the Russian text more precisely than the other translations, even though the resulting text is unclear.

5.13. 'Plainness of Words'[xxxix] and Euphemisms. In a target language oriented translation adapting the text to the moral norms of the target culture could either involve expurgation or, in a freer society, over-clarification, i.e. rendering clear what was meant to be slightly disguised in the original. In a source language oriented translation the text is neither bowdlerised nor over-clarified.

Venuti shows that translator's refusal to bowdlerise a text is a way of opposing domesticating tendencies within the target culture. He does so, using the example of John Nott, who in the 18th century refused to omit explicit sexual references in Catullus's poetry, explaining that

(…) when an ancient classic is translated, and explained, the work may be considered as forming a link in the chain of history: history should not be falsified, we ought therefore to translate him fairly; and when he gives us the manners of his own day, however disgusting to our sensations, and repugnant to our natures they may sometimes prove, we must not endeavour to conceal, or gloss them over. (Cit. Venuti 1994, 85)

There are several ways in which translators can bowdlerise a text: omitting references to sexual relations is by far the most common. Other ways include using a more neutral word (a euphemism) or replacing the original references to sexual relations with those acceptable within the target culture. For instance, Walter Kelly commented in 1861 that when translating Tibullus's elegy about homosexual love, he had been 'compelled to be unfaithful to the original with regard to gender' (Mason 2000, 515).

One example of Victorian Puritanism, noted by Nabokov, has already been cited in the first chapter. When, in Dole's translation, Vronsky asks Anna what is the matter with her, Anna responds in Russian: *Ya beremenna!* (Dole, 200), 'all because the translator thought that "I am pregnant" might shock some pure soul'. (Nabokov 1981, 316) In the end of Dole's translation, in the glossary of Russian words and phrases "*Ya beremenna"* is translated as 'I am expecting my confinement'.

When *Anna Karenina* was first published in America, an anonymous critic wrote in *Literary World:* ' (…) on these relations of the sexes, on the facts of parentage and motherhood, the book speaks with a plainness of meaning, sometimes with a plainness of words, which is at least new.' (Cit. Knowles 1978, 341) There are other omissions Dole makes in order to adapt Tolstoy's 'plainness of words' to the moral norms of the Victorian

society. For instance, when Anna becomes Vronsky's mistress, she starts seeing a recurrent nightmare that both Vronsky and Karenin are her husbands:

> 'Ей снилось, что оба вместе были ее мужья, **что оба расточали ей свои ласки**.' [She dreamt that both together were her husbands, that both lavished their caresses on her.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 179)

Dole only says:

> 'She dreamed that she was the wife both of Vronsky and Aleksei Aleksandrovitch.' (Dole, 162)

When, on the way from the racecourse, Anna confesses to Karenin that she loves Vronsky ('Я люблю его, я его любовница, я не могу переносить, я боюсь, я ненавижу вас…' [I love him, I am his mistress, I cannot bear, I fear, I hate you]), Dole paraphrases this confession: 'I love him, I have been false to you. I cannot endure you, I fear you, I hate you!' (Dole, 226) 'I have been false to you' therefore becomes a euphemism for 'I am his mistress'.

In part 6, chapter 5, Kitty is hoping for Koznyshev to propose to Varenka. When Varenka and Koznyshev return from the wood, Kitty realises that her plans did not come to any fruition and she tells her husband about it:

- 'Ну что? – спросил ее муж, когда они опять возвращались домой.
- Не берет, - сказала Кити, улыбкой и манерой говорить напоминая отца, что часто с удовольствием замечал в ней Левин.
- Как не берет?
- Вот так, - сказала она, взяв руку мужа, поднося ее ко рту и дотрагиваясь до нее нераскрытыми губами. – Как у архиерея руку целуют.
- У кого же не берет? – сказал он смеясь.
- У обоих. А надо, чтобы вот так…
- Мужики едут…

  Нет, они не видали.' ['Well, what is it?' – asked her husband when they were returning home again.
  'It does not take', - said Kitty, with her smile and manner of speaking reminding of her father, which Levin often noticed in her with pleasure.
  'How does it not take?'
  'Like this', - she said, taking her husband's hand, bringing it to the mouth and touching it with unopened lips. 'Like they kiss a bishop's hand.'

‘So whose does it not take?’ he said, laughing.
‘Both. And it should be like this…’
‘Muzhiks are riding…’
‘No, they did not see.] (Tolstoy, v.9, 156)

The whole of this wonderful and playful dialogue between the husband and wife is omitted in Dole’s translation, and the chapter simply ends:

‘“It will not take place,” she said to her husband as they went in.’ (Dole, 560.)

In part 3, chapter 11 Levin talks to an old man about the latter’s younger son:

- 'Уже женат?
- Да, третий год пошел с Филипповок.
- Что ж, и дети есть?
- Какие дети! Год целый **не понимал ничего**, да и стыдим, - отвечал старик.’ [‘Already married?’
‘Yes, two years from St Philip’s day.’
‘What, and are there children?’
‘What children! For a whole year he understood nothing, and is bashful’, the old man replied.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 322)

(Edmonds, in her translation, clarifies the old man’s reply substituting ‘ничего не понимать' (literally ‘to understand nothing’) for ‘being innocent as a babe’: ‘Children indeed! Why, over a year he **was innocent as a babe** himself, and bashful into the bargain.’ Edmonds, 296)

In Dole’s translation the old man’s reply is significantly abridged:

‘How? children? No, more’s the pity.’ (Dole, 288)

When Levin gives Kitty his diary before their wedding, Tolstoy comments:

'Его мучили две вещи: его **неневинность** и неверие. Признание в неверии прошло незамеченным.' [He was tormented by two things: him not being innocent and his unbelief. The confession of unbelief went unnoticed.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 477)

Compare:

> ‘Of the two delicate points with which it was concerned, the one which passed almost unnoticed was his unbelief.’ (Dole, 416)

The other point does not get named at all.

Translating Dolly’s thoughts as she travels to see Anna, Dole omits those topics, which were not normally mentioned in English language fiction during Victorian age: pregnancy, morning sickness, breastfeeding, etc:

> «Да и вообще, - думала Дарья Александровна, оглянувшись на всю свою жизнь за пятнадцать лет замужества, - **беременность, тошнота**, **тупость ума**, равнодушие ко всему и, главное, безобразие. Кити, молоденькая, хорошенькая Кити, и та так подурнела, а я беременная делаюсь безобразна, я знаю. **Роды, страдания, безобразные страдания, эта последняя минута…** потом кормление, эти бессонные ночи, эти боли страшные…» [‘And generally’, thought Darya Alexandrovna, looking back at all her life during the fifteen years of marriage, ‘pregnancy, nausea, dullness of mind, indifference to everything, and mainly ugliness. Kitty, young, pretty Kitty, even she has become unattractive, and when I am pregnant I get ugly, I know. Labour, sufferings, ugly sufferings, that last minute… then feeding, these sleepless nights, these horrible pains…’] (Tolstoy, v.9, 203.)

> “It comes to this”, she thought, as she recalled her fifteen years of married life. “My youth has been passed with a heartache, in feeling cross, disgusted with everything, and appearing hideous; for if our pretty Kitty grows ugly at such a time, what a fright I must have been!” and she shuddered as she thought of what she had suffered, - the long nights of wakefulness, the wretchedness when nursing her child, the nervousness and irritability which followed.” (Dole, 587)

After Nikolai Levin’s death, when Levin sees the mystery of death followed by the mystery of life (Part 5, 21):

> ‘Не успела на его глазах совершиться одна тайна смерти, оставшаяся неразгаданной, как возникла другая, столь же неразгаданная, вызывавшая к любви и жизни.
> Доктор подтвердил свои предположения насчет Кити. Нездоровье ее была **беременность**.' [No sooner had one mystery of death, that remained unsolved, been accomplished before his eyes, than another arose, equally unsolved, calling to love and life.
> The doctor confirmed his suppositions about Kitty. Her ill health was pregnancy.] (Tolstoy, v.9, 86),

Dole translates the last two sentences in a rather disguised fashion:

'The doctor told him of Kitty's **hopes of maternity**.' (Dole, 508)

Garnett translated *Anna Karenina* fifteen years later than Dole, and during those fifteen years Tolstoy's popularity in the English-speaking world had grown sufficiently to mend the 'Puritan taste' in translation (see chapter 2). Garnett was English, and, unlike the United States, England had its own 19th century strong tradition of the realistic novel, whilst American realism of the 1880s was 'mostly aloof from the homely and painful realities of life' (Ahnebrink 1961, 19). Also, being a woman with liberated attitudes to relationships and a mother herself, Garnett did not feel a need to omit the themes of sexual relationships and pregnancy. She, too, had some Victorian prudishness about language (see May 1994, 39), but examples of expurgation in her translation of *Anna Karenina* are rare. For example, in the sentence already quoted in chapter 3, in Garnett's translation, the nurse covers her bosom (Garnett, 477), which is definitely an advance from Dole's translation, where she just fastens her dress (Dole, 429). The bosom becomes 'well-developed breast' in Maude's translation and then 'large breast' in Edmonds' translation, as Tolstoy originally intended.[xl].

As suggested above, adapting the text to the moral norms within the target culture may mean expurgation or, in a freer society, it can involve over-clarification, i.e. rendering clear what was not meant to be absolutely clear in the original. For example, in the beginning of the book Oblonsky regretting his involvement with a governess thinks:

> 'Есть что-то тривиальное, пошлое в **ухаживании** за своею гувернанткой.' [There is something trivial, vulgar in courting one's governess.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 10)

> 'There is something trivial and common in **playing the gallant** to one's own governess!' (Dole, 8)

> 'There's something common, vulgar, in **flirting** with one's governess.' (Garnett, 4)

‘There’s something banal, a want of taste, in **carrying on** with one’s governess…’ (Maude, v.1, 4)

‘There is something banal and vulgar about **making love** to one’s own governess.’ (Edmonds, 15-16.)

‘There’s something trivial, banal in **courting** one’s own governess.’ (Pevear, 3-4.)

Edmonds’ translation clarifies Tolstoy’s intended euphemism and interprets it for the 1970s audience. Although ‘making love’ has an archaic meaning ‘to pay amorous attention’ which can be seen as an equivalent of *ухаживать*, it is unlikely that readers of Edmonds’ translation in the 1970s were expected to understand ‘making love’ in its old-fashioned meaning rather than in the modern meaning of ‘having sexual intercourse’[xli]. After all, on the very first page of the novel Edmonds mentions Oblonsky’s ‘relationship with their former French governess’ (cf. with ‘an intrigue’ in Garnett’s translation and with ‘her husband was too attentive to the French governess’ in Dole’s translation).

When Nikolai Levin refers to the institution Marya Nikolayevna had left, he calls it 'дом разврата’ – a set phrase of the time, but also with an element of condemning the institution that would not allow her to be free. Dole, Garnett and Maude translate it with a euphemism ‘the house of ill fame’ (Dole, 100; Garnett, 102; Maude, v.1, 103) which was the set phrase of the time. Edmonds clarifies the term, calling it ‘the brothel’ (Edmonds, 106.) Only Pevear’s translation gives a close lexical equivalent to the words used by Tolstoy: ‘the house of depravity’.

It is useful to note that this is the second time that Nikolai mentions the institution. Introducing Marya Nikolayevna to Levin, he simply says ‘Я взял ее из дома' [I took her from a house]. This intended euphemism is translated literally as 'I took her from a house' by Pevear, translated as 'I took her out of a bad house' by Garnett and the Maudes. Dole makes Nikolai disguise the truth further than he does in the original: 'I found her'. Edmonds over-clarifies, 'I took her out of a brothel'. This over-clarification is wrong here

because Nikolai does not want to say anything offensive about Marya Nikolayevna - and this is why he does not quite say which house he took her from.

To sum up, in order to adapt Tolstoy's novel for their contemporaries' tastes, Dole and Edmonds change it more than the other translators: Dole bowdlerises it and Edmonds over-clarifies it.

5.14. Depicting life with 'unparalleled reality'[xlii]. Nabokov called 'beautifying the original' 'a crime, to be punished by the stocks'. (Nabokov 1981, 315) One of the examples he quoted was the tradition of Russian translators of Shakespeare giving Ophelia richer flowers than the poor weeds she found in the English text.

Translators can either 'beautify' objects and characters of a novel, attempting to make them more attractive for the reader, or change the author's narrative style in order to make it more 'elegant' ('ennoblement, according to Berman – see chapter 1). As Gifford (1978, 20) says, translators of Tolstoy have to mediate between 'continuous literary decorum' and the literal text a good dictionary can supply. If to an English reader Tolstoy seems outlandish or pedantic, he will feel let down by a more source text oriented translation that is unlikely to beautify the text. For instance, Maude was criticised for his translation of *The Resurrection* when a reader wrote to *The Nation:* 'to be told in a moment of profound emotional significance that ''she looked at him with those unfathomable squinting eyes of hers'' is incontestably pathetic' (*The Nation*, 11.10.1900, 287). The reader obviously did not want Tolstoy's romantic heroine to have 'squinting' eyes.

Introducing Tolstoy's novels to English readers, Maude wrote:

> The dignity of man is hidden from us either by all kinds of defects or by the fact that we esteem other qualities too highly and therefore measure men by their cleverness, strength, beauty, and so forth. Tolstoy teaches us to penetrate beneath their externality. (Maude 1929, 429)

In chapter 2 I have already mentioned Gifford's example: when Levin visits his future parents-in-law, he is overcome with tenderness noticing how Kitty kisses her father's fleshy hand.

Garnett describes the Prince's hand as 'strong', Edmonds – as 'muscular', and Dole – as 'great' and 'strong'. As Gifford comments, presumably those translators did not want the prince to have a 'fleshy' hand (Gifford 1978, 23.) Tolstoy, however, likes the Prince with his fleshy hands and Russian wrinkles. Maude allows the Prince's hand to remain fleshy but earlier on replaces his 'крупные, облитые жиром члены' [big, fat-enveloped members] with 'large healthy limbs' (Maude, v.1, 258.). Dole also changes them for 'vigorous limbs'.

Beautification can also include correcting the author's 'mistakes' (inconsistencies). For instance, in part 3, chapter 12 Levin sees Kitty in the carriage on her way to Yergushovo. Suddenly she sees him, too:

> '**Она** узнала **его**, и удивленная радость осветила **ее** лицо.' [She recognised him, and surprised joy lit her face.] (Tolstoy v.8, 325)

Dole, in his translation, changes this sentence:

> '**He** recognized **her**, and a gleam of joy, mingled with wonder, shone upon **his** face.' (Dole, 291)

In a footnote Dole explains: 'In the original it says that she recognized Levin, and the joy shone upon her face. But it is evident, from the conversation in chap. xi. book iii., that it could not have been so.' (Ibid. 291)

In fact, it is not evident 'that it could not have been so'. In part 4, chapter 11 Levin tells Kitty about that meeting and asks her what she was thinking about at the time. Kitty answers: 'Право, не помню' [Really, I don't remember] which could mean either that she

did not remember seeing Levin or that she did not remember what she had been thinking about at the time.

5.15. Free verse.

English translators have generally managed to recreate Tolstoy's lyrical lines. For instance, below is Garnett's translation of the first passage, quoted in 4.12:

> She did not look out again. The sound of the carriage-springs was no longer audible, the bells could scarcely be heard. The barking of dogs showed the carriage had reached the village, and all that was left was the empty fields all round, the village in front and he himself isolated and apart from it all, wandering lonely along the deserted high-road. (Garnett, 314-315.)

The least lyrical is the Maude translation of the same paragraph:

> She did not look out again. The sound of the wheels could no longer be heard; the tinkling of the bells grew fainter. The barking of dogs proved that the coach was passing through the village, and only the empty fields, the village before him, and he himself walking solitary on the deserted road, were left. (Maude v.1, 315)

I believe, the lack of lyricism in this translation is mainly due to two facts: Maude changes Tolstoy's syntactic construction, putting the verb 'left' in the end of the last sentence and he leaves out the group of words defining Levin's emotional state: 'isolated and apart from it all'. The word 'prove' also sounds unnecessarily scientific in this context.

5.16. Idiosyncrasies of peasant speech.

Tolstoy admired the ways in which the peasants corrupted names of places and other words, never making up pseudo-popular words but usually taking note of those expressions he happened to overhear (Gusev 1961, 431-432). This makes it even more difficult to translate them.

Both examples, quoted in 4.13, reveal the peasants' lack of familiarity with iron ploughs, which replaced the old wooden plough.

Он пахал под картофель плугою, как он называл плуг, взятый у помещика. [He ploughed for potatoes with 'плуга' (a plough, put incorrectly in the feminine gender instead of the correct masculine one), as he called the plough, taken from the landowner.] (Tolstoy v.8, 382)

(…) и резцы в плугах не завинтят, а поснимают и потом скажут, что плуги выдумка пустая и то ли дело соха Андреевна, и т.п. [(…) and won't screw the cutters in the ploughs but take them off and then say that ploughs are a silly invention and nothing like 'соха Андреевна' (a wooden plough with a patronymic Andreevna or a plough, the daughter of Andrei). (Tolstoy v.8, 283)

In the translation of the first sentence only Pevear attempts to render the peasant's distortion of the word 'плуг' by translating it as 'plougher', the other translators do not render the mispronouncation of the word. In the second sentence Garnett translates 'соха Андреевна' as 'the old Andreevna plough', which is clearly a more foreignizing translation than 'our old Russian plough' (Maude) or 'the old good Russian plough' (Pevear).

5.17. Voices of Characters. In a target language oriented translation characters' speech is translated especially freely so that it sounds natural, as if the characters belong to the target culture at the time of the translation. In a source text oriented translation characters' speech is translated almost word for word and, as a result of it, sounds stilted and foreign.

On the other hand, target language oriented translation may level out colloquialisms, speech defects, accents, etc. in the speech of the original characters. As Christian says, Ralph Parker's translation of *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* betrays his middle-class upbringing in Britain, and the language of his semi-literate convicts reads at times like that of English public-school boys (Christian 1978, 5). He suggests that perhaps only a Russian can fully appreciate such idiosyncrasies of language

as archaisms, gallicisms, colloquialisms and slang in the speech of Tolstoy's characters (Christian 1962, 163).

Alternatively, a target language oriented translation can replace colloquialisms, distortions of speech, etc. in the source language with units that have a similar effect in the target language. The problem then is that the translation appears too fluent: if semiliterate convicts speak like English public-school boys, the reader is likely to remember that this is a translation and that in the target text the characters express themselves using the translator's language; it can sound strange if they speak a particular (British or American) variety of prison slang. It is possible to argue that readers will not see those slang expressions as Britishisms or Americanisms but simply as slang. As a similar example, when Fyodorov analyses a Russian translation of Balsac's *Eugenie Grande* he suggests that such words as 'маменька' and 'папенька' (Russian colloquial words for 'mother' and 'father') should not be seen as Russianisms but simply as colloquialisms (Fyodorov 2002, 386). Still, it is difficult for a Russian reader to believe that a French person could address their parents as *маменька* and *папенька.* It may be equally different for an English language reader to believe in Russian convicts who speak an English or American variety of slang. One of the main problems with staging Tolstoy's plays in England has been the problem of finding an authentic translation of the speech of his peasant characters. As Gareth Jones says, 'the best that an English translator can do is to transmute Russian peasants into English rural folk who then must be endowed with an accent which inevitably fixes them to a specific region' (Jones 2002, 154-155.)

a) In part 6, chapter 29 Tolstoy depicts a heated conversation of landowners during the elections:

> - 'Как он смеет говорить, что я велел украсть у него брюки! Он их **пропил**, я думаю. Мне **плевать** на него с его княжеством. Он не смеет говорить, это свинство!' [How he dares to say that I ordered to steal his trousers! He drank them away, I think. I damn him (lit. spit on him) with his princedom. He daren't say, it's swinishment!] (Tolstoy, v.8, 259.)

(This conversation is omitted in Dole's translation.)

> 'How dare he say I had his breeches stolen! **Pawned them for drink**, I expect. **Damn the fellow**, prince indeed! He'd better not say it, the beast!' (Garnett, 739)
>
> 'How dare he say I gave orders to steal his trousers? I expect he **drank** them. **I snap my fingers** at him and his princely title! He has no right to say it: it's mean!' (Maude, v.2, 252)
>
> 'How dare he say I had his breeches stolen! He probably **popped them and spent the proceeds on drink**. **Damn** the fellow and his princely title! Let him dare open his mouth, the swine!' (Edmonds, 687)
>
> 'How dare he say I ordered his trousers stolen! He **drank them up**, I suppose. **I spit** on him and his princely rank. He daren't say that, it's swinishness!' (Pevear, 655)

Garnett's and Edmonds' translations of this paragraph are the most fluent, as they make it sound natural, as if the characters were speaking English and using English colloquialisms. The literalness of Maude's and Pevear's translations creates expressions that are not English, such as 'to drink his trousers' or 'to drink up his trousers'. 'I spit on him' is a Russicism, in English this expression is used in humorous imitations of Mexican bandits[xliii]. Further on, the landowners' dispute continues:

> '- А черта мне в статье! Я говорю **по душе**. На то благородные дворяне. **Имей доверие**.' [And what the devil is for me in the article! I am speaking from the soul. For that there are noble gentry. Have trust.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 260)

The relatively rare use of the English word 'soul' in comparison with the Russian *душа* has been discussed in chapter 3. Idiomatic Russian expressions involving the word *душа* sound awkward in English whenever translators attempt to translate them, using the word 'soul'. For instance:

> 'The devil I care about the article! I'm speaking **from the soul**. That's what makes us nobility. There **has to be trust**.' (Pevear, 655)

Compare that with the other translations where translators use dynamic equivalence, resulting in more fluent English:

> 'Oh, damn your acts! I speak **from my heart**. We're all gentlemen, aren't we? **Above suspicion**.' (Garnett, 739)

> 'What the devil do I care about the statute? I speak **frankly.** That's what the Nobility are for. **One must have confidence**.' (Maude, v.2, 252)

Edmonds' translation of this passage is even freer:

> 'To the devil with your articles of the law! What I say is **perfectly true.** We're all gentlemen, aren't we? **Above suspicion**.' (Edmonds, 687)

Similarly, when in part 1, chapter 8, Levin tells his brother that he left the board of his *zemstvo,* he adds: - 'И я **от всей души** пытался.' [And I tried from my whole soul.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 36)

> 'I **put my whole heart** into it.' (Dole, 32)
>
> 'And I did try **with all my soul**.' (Garnett, 30)
>
> 'And I tried **with my whole soul**.' (Maude, v.1, 29)
>
> 'And I **put my whole heart** into it.' (Edmonds, 39)
>
> 'And I **put my whole soul** into it.' (Pevear, 26)

Dole's and Edmonds' translations of this sentence are the target language oriented, replacing the Russian expression 'от всей души' with the English image of doing something wholeheartedly.

b) Dialogues in Dole's translation come across as foreignizing because he deliberately keeps what he believes to be the way Russians speak to each other. Below is a dialogue between Kitty and Varenka and its translation by Dole:

- 'Все говорить? – спросила Варенька.
- Все, все! – подхватила Кити.

- Да особенного ничего нет, а только то, что Михаил Алексеевич (так звали живописца) прежде хотел уехать раньше, а теперь не хочет уезжать, - улыбаясь сказала Варенька.
- Ну!ну! – торопила Кити, мрачно глядя на Вареньку.
- Ну и почему-то Анна Павловна сказала, что он не хочет оттого, что вы тут. Разумеется, это было некстати, но из-за этого, из-за вас вышла ссора. А вы знаете, как эти больные раздражительны.'

- [- Should I tell everything? – asked Varenka.
- Everything, everything! – chimed in Kitty.
- Well, there is nothing special, but only that Mikhail Alekseevich (that was the artist's name) before wanted to leave earlier and now he does not want to leave, - said Varenka, smiling.
- Well? well? – rushed Kitty, gloomily looking at Varenka.
- Well, and for some reason Anna Pavlovna said that he does not want to because you are here. Obviously this was awkward, but because of it, because of you a quarrel occurred. And you know how irritable these sick people are.] (Tolstoy, v.8, 277.)

"Must I tell you all?"
"All, all", replied Kitty.
"***Da!*** At bottom there is nothing very serious: only Mikhail Alekseyevich – that was Petrof's name – was willing to leave at any time, and now he does not want to go", replied Varenka, smiling.
"**Nu! Nu**!" cried Kitty, looking at Varenka with a gloomy expression.
*"**Nu!**"*Anna Pavlovna imagines that he does not want to go because you are here. Of course, this was unfortunate; but you have been the cause of a family quarrel, and you know how irritable these invalids are." (Dole, 248)

The characters of Dole's translation talk to each other in a kind of Russian-English pidgin. To an English reader the above dialogue would appear comical: the characters seem unable to speak one language properly whereas in the Russian text they speak absolutely normally and their speech does not sound awkward. Furthermore, when Varenka speaks Russian, she does not begin her sentences with exclamations, like 'da!' and 'nu!' Dole confuses the emphatic particle *да* with the affirmative particle and the interjection *ну* with the particle *ну*. He therefore changes Varenka's intonations, makes her sound excited and does not allow her to speak with calm and dignity, which Kitty so much admires in her new friend.

c) It has been mentioned in chapter 2 that Garnett found translating dialogues more difficult than translating narrative and occasionally was unable to make adequate distinctions between peasant and high society speech, preferring proper English to

colloquialisms. On the other hand, Gifford (1978, 21) praises her sensitivity to the rhythm of ordinary speech.

In part 8, chapter 11, Fyodor the feeder, contrasting Mityukha and Fokanych, says to Levin:

> 'Вот хоть вас взять, тоже не **обидите человека**…' [Take even you, you won't harm a man either.] (Tolstoy, v.9, 419)

This is an example of rustic speech: in the high society it would be more customary to say: 'никого не обидите' [you won't offend anyone]. As Gifford comments, Garnett overlooks the 'either' ('тоже'); but she catches the rhythm of peasant speech: 'Take you now, you wouldn't **wrong a man**…' (Garnett, 893)

Garnett's translation is not cluttered with terms alien to a rustic vocabulary - unlike the Maude translation 'Take you, for instance, you won't **injure anyone** either' (Maude, v.2, 411). Gifford classifies 'injure' as a term alien to a rustic vocabulary; and there is the 'sanction of a traditional way of life' (Gifford 1978, 21) in that simple phrase 'wrong a man'.

Like Maude, Pevear, too, ignores the emphasis on 'человек' (man), the word that Fyodor repeats several times, and uses the word 'offend' which is also alien to a rustic vocabulary:

> 'Now, take you even, you wouldn't **offend anybody** either…' (Pevear, 794)

d) Another example of rustic speech:

- **Вишь**, козявки ползут! [See the midges are crawling!] (An old peasant telling Levin about children bringing mowers their lunch – Tolstoy, v.8, 298.)

Garnett recreates the colloquial sound of 'вишь' and uses a dialect word 'emmets':

'**Look'ee**, the little **emmets** crawling!' (Garnett, 287)

Maude translation does not sound rustic at all:

'Look at the midges crawling along!' (Maude, v.1, 287)

e) Tolstoy introduces the conversation at Anna and Vronsky's 'very formal'[xliv] dinner table where both Anna and the members of her household frequently use foreign words. Their conversation is thus different from more homely conversations at the Levin household:

- 'А мы думали застать вас на поле, Василий Семеныч, - обратилась она к доктору, человеку болезненному, - вы были там?
- Я был там, но улетучился, - с мрачной шутливостью отвечал доктор.
- Стало быть, вы хороший **моцион** сделали.
- Великолепный!
- Ну а как здоровье старухи? надеюсь, что не тиф?

- Тиф не тиф, а **не в авантаже** обретается. [- And we thought to find you in the field, Vassily Semyonych, - she turned to the doctor, a sickly man, - were you there?
- I was there but flew myself off, - responded the doctor with gloomy jocularity.
- Therefore you had a good motion.
- Splendid!
- Well and how is the old woman's health? I hope that it's not typhus?
- Typhus or not typhus, but she is not finding herself in advantage.] (Tolstoy, v.9, 232.)

Dole omits this dialogue. Other translators have to deal with such non-Russian words in the Russian dialogue as 'моцион' and 'авантаж' (the latter is clearly a foreign word, not even registered in Dal's dictionary, and the doctor probably uses it in order to 'show off'). These foreign words stylistically contribute to the description of the impersonal and strained character of Anna and Vronsky's dinner, the table and the conversation. Garnett translates 'моцион' as 'constitutional' – a relatively new meaning of the word in English, only appearing in the early 19th century. Maude and Edmonds' translations of this dialogue consist of more natural speech:

'(…) Then you have had some good **exercise**?'
'Magnificent!'
'And how is the old woman? I hope it is not typhus?'
'No, it's not exactly typhus, but she's **not in a good state**.' (Maude, v.2, 224)

'(…) Then you got some good **exercise**?'
'First-rate!'
'Well, and how was the old woman? I hope it's not typhus?'

'Typhus or not, she's **in a bad way'**. (Edmonds, 662)

Phrases like ‘she’s not in a good state’ or ‘she’s in a bad way’ are written in a language that is too widely used, too fluent in comparison with the foreignness of the Russian phrase ‘не в авантаже обретается'. Pevear’s translation of this last sentence is more literal and more source text oriented - 'Typhus or no, her condition is not of the most advantageous' (Pevear, 631). In this sentence the word ‘advantageous’, although not as foreign to an English reader as ‘в авантаже' is to a Russian reader, is still more foreign and belongs to a more 'sophisticated' vocabulary than the expression 'in a bad way' does.

This section shows that all the translators found it difficult to convey different voices of characters in *Anna Karenina.* Although Richard Garnett writes that Garnett was occasionally unable to make adequate distinctions between peasant and high society speech, she attempted to do it more than the later translators, especially Maude who frequently levelled out colloquialisms and unusual words in Tolstoy’s dialogues.

5.18. Translating quotations from the Bible.

Tolstoy’s characters frequently quote verses from the Bible. The scriptural proverb ‘Let him who has not sinned cast the first stone’ is referred to several times in the novel. Hogan (1998, 82) points out that the first reference to the proverb occurs at the ball. When Kitty arrives, she overhears a conversation in which Anna declares, ‘Нет, я не брошу камня’. [‘No, I won’t throw a stone’] (Tolstoy v. 8, 97) – the reader, like Kitty, never finds out what Anna was talking about. Dole and Maude take a liberty in translation: ‘No: I would not cast **the first stone** (Dole, 88); ‘No, I am not going to throw **the first** stone’ (Maude v.1, 89). This is yet another example of clarification: as Hogan (1998, 82) comments, the translators wanted to be sure that the English reader would notice this ‘‘unmotivated’’ bit of dialogue. Garnett’s translation of the same phrase is even more ‘unmotivated’ than the original: ‘No, I don’t throw stones’ (Garnett, 88). Pevear (79)

translates Anna's phrase literally as 'No, I won't cast a stone' and provides an annotation explaining that Anna quotes a verse from the scripture.

5.19. Translating poetry as intertextuality. In poetry a greater scope of differences is possible between source text- and target language-oriented translation techniques than in prose. Target language-oriented translation replaces the original metre and rhyme scheme with the metre and rhyme scheme, characteristic of the target language poetry, creating equivalence of effect. Rhymed poetry can be replaced by a blank verse or even by prose. Source text-oriented translation preserves the original metre and rhyme even if those are unusual for poetry of the target language. (Kochol 1970, 106-107, Weissbort 2000)

Anna Karenina is, of course, written in prose, and therefore a detailed essay on translating poetry would be out of place here. When the characters of *Anna Karenina* occasionally quote poetry lines, it becomes more of a problem of literary allusions and literal quotations. The poetry lines they quote become part of their voice, and they reflect their background, tastes, etc. As Christian (1978, 5) comments, many translators, even if they know both English and Russian fluently, have lacked a proper background knowledge of Russian literature and history. He therefore suggests that the best English translations of Russian fiction are being done by professors and lecturers in British and American universities.

As an example of a translator lacking proper background knowledge of the culture to which the author and the characters of *Anna Karenina* belong, one can quote Nathan Dole. When, on the day of his wedding, Levin eats his lunch in the company of three bachelors, one of them suggests that he must feel like jumping out of the window, like one of the suitors in Gogol's comedy *The Marriage*:

- А признайтесь, есть это чувство, как у гоголевского жениха, что в окошко хочется выпрыгнуть? [But admit, is there this feeling, like Gogol's suitor had, that one feels like jumping out of the window?] (Tolstoy, v.9, 15)

Dole duly translates it:

''Confess that, like Gogolevsky, when he was engaged, you feel like jumping out of the window.'' (Dole, 451)

In part 1, chapter 10 Oblonsky quotes (imprecisely) Pushkin's poem *From Anacreon:*

> - 'Узнаю коней ретивых по каким-то их таврам, юношей влюбленных узнаю по их глазам, - продекламировал Степан Аркадьевич.' (Tolstoy v.8, 48.)

Dole does not seem to recognise that Oblonsky is reciting poetry :

> ''I know fiery horses by their brand, and I know young people who are in love by their eyes,'' said Stepan Arkadyevitch dramatically…' (Dole, 43.)

Garnett preserves the metre but not the rhyme; however, to show that Oblonsky is quoting poetry she splits the quotation into two lines:

> 'I know a gallant steed by tokens sure,
> And by his eyes I know a youth in love' (Garnett, 41.)

The Maudes preserve the metre and the rhyme in their translation:

> '''Fiery steeds'' by *something* brands
> I can always recognize ;
> Youths in love at once I know,
> By the look that lights their eyes !''' (Maude v.1, 41.)

Edmonds puts the rhyme in a different place:

> '''By the mark of your steed
> I can tell his fine breed,
> And a young man in love – by his eyes'''[xlv] (Edmonds, 50.)

Pevear preserves both the rhyme and the partially broken metre to show where Oblonsky has forgotten the quotation. The quotation in his text is written in one line, as it is in Tolstoy's original:

> 'Bold steeds I can tell by their something-or-other thighs, and young men in love by the look in their eyes' (Pevear, 36.)

Pevear's translation of these lines is closest to the original.

In part 2, chapter 16 Oblonsky quotes two lines from Derzhavin's ode *God:*

- 'Сочесть пески, лучи планет хотя и мог бы ум высокий…' (Tolstoy, v.8, 198.)

Dole puts these lines in rather imprecise vers libre :

> ''Count the sand on the seashore, count the rays of the planets – though a lofty genius might'' (Dole, 179.)

Garnett's version is still further from the original – in metre, in word and in sense:

> 'Count the sands of the sea, number the stars. Some higher power might do it.' (Garnett, 188.)

Maude preserves Derzhavin's four-foot iambic metre and meaning:

> ''Count grains of sand, and planets' rays,
> E'en though a lofty mind were able…'' (Maude, v.1, 188.)

Edmonds translates with blank verse :

> 'Count the sands of the seas, number the planets. Even a great mind…' (Edmonds, 183.)

Pevear preserves the metre, but his translation is not as exact as the Maudes'; however, like Tolstoy, he writes Oblonsky's quotation in one line:

> 'To count the sands, the planets' rays, a lofty mind well may…' (Pevear, 167.)

The problem with translating quoted poetry lines within a novel is that target text readers cannot be expected to have the same familiarity with the original poetry (or with its translations) as source text readers do. In other words, Tolstoy could write a poetry quotation from Pushkin or Derzhavin in one line, and the Russian reader would know it is poetry not only because of its metre but also because of the familiarity of those lines. It is much more difficult for a translator to convey to the English reader that this is poetry, that it is famous and that Levin, Vronsky and Oblonsky recognise it straight away. Taking domestication in translating quotations within a novel to the extreme, a translator could replace famous Russian poetry with equally famous English poetry that roughly has a similar meaning, for example, replacing Pushkin's line with Shakespeare's lines. A source text oriented strategy for translating quotations would necessarily involve indicating where the quotation is from and giving the reader some background information. As far as the examples above are concerned, the source of the first quotation is indicated in Maude's and Pevear's translations, the source of the second quotation is indicated only in Pevear's translation.

5.20. Presenting Tolstoy's views and beliefs in translation. A text can be falsified, i.e. domesticated under the influence of the translator's beliefs. As it was described in chapter 1, Chapman used his translation of *Odyssey* to demonstrate his own political preferences. In a foreignizing translation the translator's beliefs and personality will not interfere with those of the author.

In order to analyse foreignization vs. domestication in this respect, one needs to be familiar with the translator's beliefs and also with the translator's attitude towards the author's beliefs. Venuti suggests that when author and translator live in the same historical moment, they are more likely to share a common sensibility, and that increases the fidelity of the translated text to the original. The voice that the reader hears in any translation made on the basis of simpatico, is always recognised as the author's, never as a translator's, not even as some hybrid between the two (Venuti 1994, 273-274). No translator of Tolstoy left as much commentary on Tolstoy's beliefs as Aylmer Maude. Even though Maude discovered Tolstoy in the very beginning of his translating career and developed a strong affinity with his ideas, which presupposes the ideal simpatico situation, he, at least in the later part of his life, approached Tolstoy's ideals critically, as he put it in his *Life of Tolstoy*:

…I have taken pains to understand Tolstoy's views and to recognize the good in them ; but being a Westerner, I am also aware of certain things Tolstoy overlooked which seem to knock big holes in some of his cherished 'principles'. (Maude 1929, v.1, xiii.)

Maude devoted forty years of his life to the presentation of Tolstoy's works to the English-speaking world (Maude v.2, xviii) and annotations were very much a part of his translation strategy. He strove to present *Anna Karenina* to the English readers as a novel containing much of what was autobiographical 'as to events, convictions, and reflections alike' (Ibid., xviii). For example, in part 6, chapter 23, when Anna and Dolly talk about

birth control, Maude comments in a note: 'One can see that Tolstoy sympathized with the views expressed by Dolly' (Maude, v.2, 440.) Dolly clearly thinks that birth control is immoral. That was Tolstoy's belief, too, but not Aylmer Maude's belief. Being one of the closest friends of Marie Stopes, the British pioneer of birth control, Maude wrote in her biography:

> …I feel sure that many catholics who value intellectual integrity must blush to read the pitiful futilities that are put forward as the Catholic case against birth control. (…) For instance, they habitually confuse abortion – that is, the killing of the embryo after conception – which is a dangerous and harmful practice, and a criminal offence in English law, with the prevention of conception, which is neither dangerous, nor harmful, nor a legal offence. (Maude 1924, 173-174.)

In another annotation Maude comments on Koznyshev's argument in favour of the Russian government declaring war on Turkey in 1877 in order to support the Serbian Army. Koznyshev says:

> Our brothers by blood and religion are being killed. Well, say they were not even our brothers or co-religionists, but simply children, women, and old people ; one's feelings are outraged, and Russians hasten to help to stop those horrors. Imagine that you were going along a street and saw a tipsy man beating a woman or a child ; I think you you would not stop to ask whether war had or had not been declared against that man, but you would rush at him and defend the victim ! (Maude, v.2, 424.)

Maude comments:

> The argument Koznyshev puts up is defective, because what each of us (brought up among people who approve of violence) would instinctively do if we felt strong enough is not necessarily what ought to be done by people who have learnt that violence begets evil. In the instance selected, or devised, to make out a case in favour of violence, the woman or child mentioned might perhaps benefit, regarding the matter from the point of view of immediate expedience ; but it should also be taken into consideration that such successful and beneficial violence tends to perpetuate the belief in force – a belief which is the source of much of the world's suffering and evil. (Maude, v.2, 446-447.)

Maude presents this comment as his own opinion, although it, of course, reflects Tolstoy's condemnation of any violence between men. Maude himself did not completely agree with Tolstoy's theory of non-resistance to evil. Elsewhere he wrote:

The justification for using force to one's neighbour lies in the fact that there are circumstances under which (judging the matter with one's facilities at their best) one would oneself wish to be restrained by force. All that Tolstoy says, holds good as against malevolent, vindictive and revengeful force ; but it breaks down as soon as we have to consider cases in which a man's motive for using force (or for using the law) is a well-considered belief that it is, on the whole, the best course to pursue in the ultimate interest of the various people concerned. (Maude 1904, 303.)

Maude outlived Tolstoy by almost thirty years, so he used annotations to comment on Tolstoy's political views in relationship to the 20th century Russian politics. For example, he mentions that Tolstoy's description of a parliamentary election in *Anna Karenina* helps us to understand Tolstoy's distrust and disapproval of parliamentary institutions in general and then adds: 'Lenin's attitude towards parliamentary institutions coincided with Tolstoy's, though his desire to seize power and readiness to employ violence for that purpose would have been utterly abhorrent to Tolstoy.' (Maude, v.2, 441.)

It is impossible to comment on all the translators' attitudes towards Tolstoy's beliefs for two reasons. Firstly, no other translator has commented on Tolstoy's views – in the commentary to their translation or elsewhere – as much as Maude. Secondly, the reception of Tolstoy in the West has, of course, been changing from the 1880s throughout the 20th century. It is useful to remember what Mounin wrote about the problems of translatability from Russian into French:

The entire history of all the contacts between these two languages should be taken into consideration: translating from Russian to French in 1960 is not the same as translating from Russian into French in 1760 (or even 1860) since the first French-Russian dictionary did not yet exist. From the eighteenth century, onwards, each translator from Russian, each voyage, each account of a voyage, would serve to augment a 'situation commune' between Russian and French, each contact lighting the path for others until, with the vogue for

> Turgenev, Tolstoy and Dostoevsky, these contacts were extended to millions of French readers. With each step the distance between the two 'situations non-communes' is diminished. (Mounin 1963, 277)

The foreignness of the foreign text is therefore gradually reduced as well, and that happens independently of the translator's choice. The meteoric rise of Tolstoy's popularity in the English-speaking world began while Tolstoy was still alive, and his stature as 'sage and prophet' can be said to have preceded his fame as novelist, so his beliefs and ideas were quickly assimilated and canonised. However, already in 1901 a reviewer of *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* wrote about Tolstoy:

> On the one hand he is an artist, on the other he is a fanatic. The present generation knows him best as a preacher of impossible dogmas (…) But his fanaticism will pass and be forgotten with other systems of the same kind; his masterpieces of fiction will guard their niche in the temple of fame for all time. (Knowles 1978, 363.)

With every translation, with every publication on Tolstoy his ideas became less foreign, and subsequent translators already did not need to explain or justify those ideas to their readers.

5.21. Conclusion. In this chapter five translations of *Anna Karenina* were compared in order to see how different translators recreate the peculiarities of Tolstoy's style and the voices of his characters.

The analysis has shown that lexical repetitions, the most striking characteristic of Tolstoy's style, are preserved consistently only in Pevear's and Garnett's translations, whilst the Maudes avoid repetitions as much as possible, not attempting to achieve equivalence with Tolstoy's style.

Dole omits the most and bowdlerises the text more than any other translator; Edmonds modernises the text, making more obvious what Tolstoy (or his characters)

choose to disguise. Generally, Maude and Edmonds clarify the most, even ‘deciphering’ Tolstoy’s metonymic sentences in the text.

Unlike the other translators, Pevear refuses to beautify Tolstoy’s text and ‘corrects’ it less than the other translators.

Generally, Garnett and Pevear match Tolstoy’s style in the narration more closely than the other translators.

Garnett’s and Edmonds’s translations of dialogues are more fluent, whilst Maude’s and Pevear’s translations of dialogues are sometimes stilted and full of calques. Dole’s translations of dialogues are full of transliterated Russian words, especially particles, as he tries to recreate the way he believes Russians speak to each other.

Pevear preserves the sound effect of Tolstoy’s onomatopoetic words better than the other translators do.

The translations of poetic quotations by Maude and Pevear are closer to the quotations in Tolstoy’s text; they are the only translators to comment on the sources of the quotations.

Although Dole wrote that Tolstoy should be reproduced ‘in all his rugged strength’ (see chapter 2), his translation does not really reproduce the important elements of Tolstoy’s style. That is not surprising, bearing in mind, that for Dole’s contemporaries Tolstoy seemed ‘a quintessential realist’ who used no deliberate stylistic devices, and that Dole’s critics saw the reproduction of Tolstoy’s style desirable mainly for ‘the proper psychological study of the author’ (chapter 2). As Natasha Sankovitch (1998, 16-17) points out, Tolstoy’s repetitions were not seen as deliberate until Merezhkovsky’s study *Tolstoy and Dostoevsky* which was published in 1901-1902, that is fifteen years after Dole’s translation was published. It is Garnett’s sensitivity as a translator that allowed her to recognise Tolstoy’s deliberate effort ‘not to write good Russian’ (see chapters 2 and 4), to appreciate those passages where ‘no word could be changed without loss’ and to preserve them in her translation.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

This thesis traces the history of translating *Anna Karenina* into English against the background of the general history of English language translation (described in chapter 1). Chapter 2 describes how different translators came to translating the book, what exactly they said about their work and how their translations were received in the English speaking world. In chapters 3 and 5 five translations of *Anna Karenina* have been compared for linguistic signs of domestication/foreignization.

'Domestication' and 'foreignization' were first defined in Venuti's works. Domesticating translation is defined as a replacement of the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text with a text that is intelligible to the target-language reader (Venuti 1995, 4-5; 18). 'Foreignizing translation indicates the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text, but it can do so only by disrupting the cultural codes that prevail in the domestic language' (Venuti 2002, 10.) For example, Venuti describes Patrick Creagh's translation of a novel by Antonio Tabucchi as foreignizing (from the point of view of an American reader), since Creagh renders the Italian expression 'in ferie' as 'on holiday', whereas the American English rendering is 'on vacation' (Ibid.11). Therefore, as it was said in chapter 1, following Venuti, one can talk about two different types of foreignizing discursive strategies. One is the deformation of the target language in order to match the source language, and the other one is the deformation of the target language without matching the source language, simply to indicate the general

‘foreignness’ of the source text. In my research I see foreignization more as the first type, as an attempt to recreate certain aspects of the source text.

In *The Translator’s Invisibility* Venuti describes tension between domestication and foreignization in the history of English translation. Similarly, I chose to study domestication vs. foreignization in their historical context since one of my objectives was to see any general tendencies between earlier and later translations. All the translators of *Anna Karenina* had to balance between two different languages with their different structures and two cultural milieus with their different concepts. Since modern English language readers are more familiar with Russian language, literature and culture as well as with Tolstoy’s works than the 19th century readers were, theoretically speaking, translating Tolstoy in 2000 should be easier than it was in 1886. In reality each translator still had to choose between the adequate representation of Tolstoy’s text and the acceptability of their translation for their contemporary English speaking audiences (the terms described in Toury 1995, 56; see also Juliane House’s translation quality assessment, 1977) on a sliding scale between audience and text. In a way, with the higher development of the art and scholarship of translation, the readers’ and the critics’ expectations grow, and adequate representation of a text in a different language becomes more difficult.

Analysing several French translations of *War and Peace,* Motyleva describes three stages of development: from a carelessly free translation to a literal one and then to ‘художественно полноценный перевод', by which she means a translation without omissions, neither word for word nor inaccurate, an artistic recreation of the original (Motyleva 1978, 32). She adds that those stages are not as clear in the history of English translations of *War and Peace*, but the general tendency remains similar. If at the early stages Tolstoy’s translators at best could reproduce the meaning of the text, in the second half of the 20th century they began to think on how to convey Tolstoy’s style in a foreign language. (Ibid. 131-132.)

As it was suggested in chapter 1, literary translation evolves as a gradual exploration of deeper layers of the source text. Foreignization as an exploration of how to preserve the foreign in the text of a novel has evolved from Newman's fidelity to the peculiarities of the source language (Newman 1856), towards Nabokov's fidelity to the original author's style (Nabokov 1981, 319), and towards fidelity to the voices of individual characters. In this thesis I have tried show how the history of translation of *Anna Karenina* into English reflects these different stages of evolution.

Nathan Dole's translation of *Anna Karenina* (1866) can be seen as an example of Victorian foreignization. It was published thirty years after Newman's *Iliad*, yet it, too, has a three-page glossary, consisting of several Russian words, like Artelshchik (railway porter), Da, vot (Yes, here), Domovoi (household spirit dwelling behind the stove), Eka (There!), Glian-ka (Look at that!), papasha (diminutive of Pap), Ish-tui (Look you), etc. Dole inserted Russian words in his translation, whether or not they could be seen as culture-specific, thus offering his readers to taste a flavour of a different language. On the other hand, he did not attempt to recreate Russian syntactic constructions or any aspects of Tolstoy's style, possibly because his knowledge of Russian was not sufficient. Like Newman, Dole saw nothing wrong with bowdlerising the source text, omitting details relating to sex, pregnancy and breastfeeding (see 6.9), or correcting details of Tolstoy's narration (see 6.10).

Dole's use of pidgin Russian and his omissions made his translation of *Anna Karenina* appear to Constance Garnett 'so exceptionally bad that it gives hardly any idea of the original' (Richard Garnett 1991, 191.) She translated the novel into fluent English, replacing Russian culture-specific words with their English equivalents and Russian grammar constructions with those constructions that are more widely acceptable in English. Her translation of *Anna Karenina* (1901) was therefore more domesticating than Dole's translation. Many commentators have criticised Garnett for her tendency to smooth over the stylistic differences of the authors she translated (see May 1994, 40). The

research, conducted in the present thesis, however, shows that Garnett, with her classical education and literary background[xlvi] was able to appreciate Tolstoy's 'wonderful passages (…) where one feels no word could be changed without loss' (Cit. Garnett, 1991, 205.) As a result, she actually changed Tolstoy's syntax less frequently than the other translators and preserved the most meaningful of his repetitions (see chapter 5). Therefore one cannot agree with Motyleva when, commenting on Galsworthy's opinion that Tolstoy's style 'is by no means remarkable'[xlvii], she says that Tolstoy's style is not at all remarkable in Constance Garnett's 'neutralised' translation (Motyleva 1978, 224-225). By 'neutralisation' Motyleva means that Garnett occasionally splits Tolstoy's long sentences up (although less frequently than Maude) and sometimes fails to reproduce the variety of characters' voices, especially the use of colloquialisms and proverbs (Ibid. 98-99).

If one compares Garnett's translation of *Anna Karenina* with the translation by Maude, then on a more superficial level the latter appears more foreignizing: Maude preserves Russian words, *kvas* and *dacha,* and Russian measure units, and uses the word 'soul' to translate *душа* even when this results in awkward sentences. On the other hand, Maude eliminates most of Tolstoy's lexical repetitions and over-clarifies the text, destroying some of Tolstoy's narrative effects and levelling his style. Therefore on a higher level (fidelity to the author's style) the Maude translation is more domesticating than Garnett's translation.

The examples of Dole and Maude show that translations may be radically oriented to the source text in some respects, but depart radically from the source text in other respects. Dole foreignized Russian vocabulary but bowdlerised the text; Maude was faithful to the narrative but distorted Tolstoy's style. The next translation of *Anna Karenina* was altogether more domesticating than the previous ones. In some respects Rosemary Edmonds' translation (1954 and 1978) is very similar to Garnett's translation. They both avoid using Russian words or lexical calques from the Russian language; and their dialogues are more fluent than those in the other translations; they explain the

meaning of Russian gestures rather than simply describe the gesture; and occasionally Edmonds repeats Garnett's mistakes. Yet, as chapters 5 shows, Edmonds changes Tolstoy's style more than Garnett does. Another reason why Edmonds' translation is the most domesticating of all is because she modernises the text as well as anglicising it. As it was shown earlier, she occasionally translates *душа* [soul] as 'mind' or 'brain', *ухаживать* [to court] as 'to make love'. Even in the very beginning of the novel, when Tolstoy introduces Oblonsky as 'Stiva, as he was called in the high society', Edmonds translates: 'Stiva, as he was generally called by his friends' (Edmonds, 13.) The translation of this sentence is inaccurate and can be explained through Edmonds attempting to make Tolstoy more accessible to the hoi polloi.

The strategy followed by Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation of *Anna Karenina* (2000) is clearly formulated by the translators themselves: 'to allow our language to be strongly affected not only by the Russian, but in this case, by Tolstoy's Russian.' (Pevear 2000, vi.) This is the second level of foreignization – fidelity to the original author's style. Pevear and Volokhonsky's task has been helped by their study of critical sources, in particular of Nabokov's *Lectures on Russian Literature,* where Nabokov points out repetitions and other aspects of Tolstoy's style in *Anna Karenina* that have been muted by previous translators. Their task has also been made more difficult because of the high expectations for 'a more adventurous rendering', as suggested by Catriona Kelly just before their translation came out (2000, 594). If in the 1920s Maude criticised his fellow translators for elementary mistakes in their translations of Tolstoy's novels, aiming for an accurate albeit corrected version, the post-war critics were specifically looking for fidelity to Tolstoy's style. Kelly's verdict was that all the translators before Pevear and Volokhonsky had been ''disappointingly insensitive to the style that readers of the Russian text would identify as characteristically 'Tolstoyan'' (Ibid. 592.) In her otherwise negative review of Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation of *Anna Karenina* Kelly admits that Pevear and Volokhonsky sometimes do 'hug' the phrasing of the original.

And yet, as it was pointed out in chapter 2, Pevear's inclination to view each word as the author's careful choice, 'treating the English language as recklessly as Tolstoy did his mother-tongue' (Kelly 2000, 594), results in a stilted quality of language in dialogues. Tolstoy may have had a characteristically 'Tolstoyan' style, but his characters have their own individual voices, which sound fluent and natural in Russian, but occasionally come across as strange and stilted in Pevear's English. Recreating voices of individual characters so that they sound natural in the target language yet preserve something of their original qualities[xlviii] is one of the most difficult translation tasks, 'the sort of success (…) to which every translator of a novel ought to aspire' (Berman 2000, 296).

If Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation represents the second level of foreignization: fidelity to the original author's style, it may be possible to suggest that the next translator of *Anna Karenina* will also listen to the voices of individual characters and attempt to introduce them as belonging to a particular age, language and culture. Evolution in translation does not necessarily mean that a later translation is better than an earlier one; in fact, in my view, Garnett's translation of *Anna Karenina* remains the best. Evolution means that translators who want their translation to indicate linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text do it in a different way from their predecessors: rather than preserve foreign words in the target text, they aim to recreate in another language the peculiarities of the author's style and their effect on the reader. As May points out, 'the new attention to nuance is laudable, but there is one further step to take in conceptualizing the translation of polyphony' (May 1994, 54) which suggests indicating linguistic and cultural differences in the voices of characters whilst preserving the effect they have on target language readers.

NOTES

[i] (…)'like the good portraitist, the translator is to study his subject not himself; only by proper attention to the author who ''sits to him'' can he capture the individuating characteristics of the classic he seeks to interpret'. (Cit. T.R. Steiner 1975, 36)
[ii] Arnold did not really offer a model of translation since he himself had 'neither the time nor the courage' to translate Homer. (Arnold 1905, 33.)
[iii] It is interesting that a similar opinion was expressed ten years later in a letter in The Times Literary Supplement : 'A remarkable original English (American ?) poem flickers and glows behind his weird pre-Wordsworthian words – an unsought reward for his breathless research to be accurate'. (Times Literary Supplement, 21 January 1977, 70.)
[iv] At least, between modern languages – see Tymoczko's comments below.
[v] That is what happened with the Wycliffite Bible, for instance – the earlier version is more literal, the later is more attentive to the rhythms of English syntax, and is accompanied by a prologue. (Roger Ellis, The Middle Ages. In The Oxford Guide To Literature In English Translation, edited by Peter France, Oxford University Press 2000, 44.)
[vi] The first French translation of Anna Karenina (Paris: Hachette, 1885).
[vii]'Передайте мой привет вашей жене. Пользуюсь случаем еще раз поблагодарить ее за прекрасный перевод «Царства божия внутри вас.»' [Give my regards to your wife. I use this occasion to thank her once again for the beautiful translation of *The Kingdom of God Inside You.]* (From Tolstoy's letter to Edward Garnett, 2.1.1900 – Tolstoy, 1965, v.18)
[viii] Wiener's, Townsend's, Carmichael's and Wettlin's translations have not been analysed in detail in this thesis.
[ix] To fulfil that difficult task would be exactly the kind of success Berman had in mind, when he praised Maurice Betz' translation of *The Magic Mountain* – see chapter 1.
[x] Unfortunately, Maude's article only deals with blunders in the translations of *War and Peace* – as he says, to deal with Tolstoy's other works 'would take too long'.
[xi] The Maudes' translation of *Anna Karenina* is not completely free of mistakes. In part 2, chapter 27, they translate *высокий генерал* as *a highly-placed general* instead of a *tall general.* In part 6, chapter 24, they translate the French *je fais des passions* as *I have love affairs,* making Anna admit to Dolly that she is having a love affair with Veslovsky!
[xii] One can suggest that Maude was trying to bring the text closer to his 1918 readers.
[xiii] The correct Russian form is, of course, Tolstaya.
[xiv] This is not quite true though as Tolstoy's sentence, too, sounds quite awkward and foreign in Russian. Dole changes it into more fluent English, saying ''Though she had been keenly afraid that he would not receive her confidence with due appreciation, she was now vexed that he deduced from it the absolute necessity of energetic action.''
[xv] I do not totally agree with this observation. The reviewer presumably sees those different translations as successive stages on the road towards a perfect translation 'that looks as if it had been written by an English master of the novel without sacrificing the verbal accuracy that scholarship would demand'. Yet Edmonds' translation is less accurate than the Maudes' translation. Also, as I will try to show further, Garnett's translation is more domesticating than Dole's, the Maudes' translation is in some respects more foreignizing than Garnett's, Edmonds' translation is more domesticating than the Maudes', etc. I do agree with the reviewer that the translations of *Anna Karenina* are often not that far apart. There is, however, a good reason why there are more differences between different English versions of the Greek classics than between different translations of the Russian classics – the greater distance in time allows for more choices between historicising and modernising as well as between exoticising and naturalising, as described by Holmes (Holmes 1972).

[xvi] I find Edmonds' translation of *Anna Karenina* to be nearer to Garnett's than to the Maudes' version – Edmonds even repeats Garnett's blunders.
[xvii] This passage by Tolstoy had been previously pointed out by Chukovsky as an example of repetitions a translation has to reproduce. (Leighton 1984, 144.)
[xviii] Which had been recognised by the previous translators with the exception of Dole. (M.B-H.)

[xix] It is possible that the early translators of *Anna Karenina* did not know the exact meaning of *пуд* – hence forty instead of four in Dole's translation and the obscurity of Garnett's translation.

[xx] It is interesting that Anna herself distinguishes between her heart and soul, seeing the former as the organ of love ('I don't have a large enough heart to love a whole orpanage of nasty little girls' – Tolstoy, v.9, 309, my translation) and the latter as a seat of confusing emotions ('Each of us has skeletons in his soul' – Tolstoy, v.8, 119, my translation).

[xxi] Motyleva has commented on Maude's strategy, trying to make things as easy as possible for the reader. An example: in his notes to *War and Peace* at Pierre Bezukhov's first appearance Maude warns the reader in the footnote that this is one of the two principal characters in the novel. When the little princess Bolkonsky is introduced, Maude comments that it is the sister-in-law of princess Mary Bolkonsky, mentioned earlier. (Motyleva 1978, 115.)

[xxii] Nabokov 1981, 225.
[xxiii] Tolstoy, of course, meant *vous* but chose to write *вы* in Russian rather than in French. As Lyons points out, much of the conversation that is given in Russian in *Anna Karenina* should be understood as if it were in French. Tolstoy used very little French in *Anna Karenina* – as opposed to *War and Peace,* where whole letters and conversations are given in French. At the time when Tolstoy was contemplating *Anna Karenina,* he obviously chose to 'Russianize' his own writing and systematically translated the French paragraphs of *War and Peace* into Russian for its third edition in 1873. (Lyons 1980, 239)

[xxiv] Although Dole occasionally distinguishes between *ты* and *вы*, he does not do it very consistently : for instance, when Anna talks to Dolly, she says : ''I saw Stiva when he was in love with thee. I remember the time when he used to come to me and talk about thee with tears in his eyes. I know to what a poetic height he raised thee, and I know that the longer he lived with thee the more he admired thee.We always have smiled at his habit of saying at every opportunity, '*Dolly is an extraordinary woman.'* You have been, and you always will be, an object of adoration in his eyes…'' (Dole, 79.)

[xxv]In Russian there are no articles, and possessive pronouns are used much more seldom than they are in English, therefore when translating from Russian into English, the translator often has to add a possessive pronoun.

[xxvi] *Лик* and *Василий Шишков*. In Vladimir Nabokov (V. Sirin), Sobranie sochinenii russkogo perioda, St Petersburg, Symposium: 2003: 376-397 and 407-413; Vladimir Nabokov, *Tyrants Destroyed and Other Stories*, London, Penguin Books: 1981: 71-98 and 191-200.
[xxvii] Slovar russkogo iazyka v 4 tomah. Moscow, Russkii iyazyk, 1983 : volume 3, 594.
[xxviii] The best translation, in my opinion, is offered by Sydney Schultze in *The Structure Of Anna Karenina :* 'I had business with a Jew, and I jewst had to wait' (Schultze 1982, 75).
[xxix] The middle ground solution here is the one offered by Margaret Wettlin who both describes the gesture and explains its meaning: 'giving an exasperated wave of his hand'. (Wettlin 1977, v.2, 147.)
[xxx] Part 2, chapter 3; twice in part 2, chapter 35; and three times in part 5, 16.

[xxxi] For example, Motyleva, analysing a Polish translation of *War and Peace,* comments on the difficulty of translating the old Prince Bolkonsky's utterance to his daughter: 'Мне сделали пропозицию насчет вас' [I've been made a proposition concerning you']. He repeats this non-Russian word 'пропозиция' three times, which emphasises his disapproval of this particular 'proposition'. Since Polish has more words of Latin origin than Russian, the Polish word 'propozycja' does not create the same contrast with the rest of the text as the Russian word does, therefore the emphasis on its foreignness is lost. (Motyleva 1978, 153)

[xxxii] It may be interesting to notice that Garnett's spelling of the name differs from that of other translators. I believe, it can be explained by rather personal reasons: Constance Garnett's mother was called Clara, and

Constance herself was christened as Constance Clara Black, and presumably she did not want to use her mother's name as a collective noun for demimonde women. Garnett's choice of 'Klara' over 'Clara' can be also seen as source-text oriented, since this name would have come into the Russian language through German and Polish, where it is spelt with K.

[xxxiii] Dole occasionally inserts Russian nouns in the text together with their Russian grammatical endings, exotising the text even further: '*tiutkof*' (Accusative plural). In his treatment of Russian words he is not consistent, for instance, using the Russian plural ending '*kozyavki,* lady bugs' and only a few sentences later using a Russian word with the English plural ending : the *telyegas.* (Dole, 266.)

[xxxiv] The word 'twit' with the meaning 'a foolish or ineffectual person' was not available to the early translators of *Anna Karenina*: its first mention in the Oxford English Dictionary dates to 1934.
[xxxv] Sheldon's article was written before Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation was published. In a later review he checked their translation of this paragraph and concluded that they had 'passed with flying colours'.
[xxxvi] Three sentences from this paragraph are quoted by Bondarko in *Вид И Время Русского Глагола* as a demonstration of the emphasis on the continuity of a series of actions (Bondarko 1971, 82.)
[xxxvii] That is apart from Wiener, who translates :

When she made her appearance in the drawing-room, it was not he, but Yashvin, who met her glance. He was looking at the pictures of her son, which she had forgotten on the table, and was in no hurry to look up at her. (Wiener, v.10, 466.)
[xxxviii] Of course, it will soon become obvious that Karenin's success was not final and Stremov managed to overplay him (see part 4, chapters 6 and 17).
[xxxix] Knowles 1978, 341.
[xl] Wiener has 'large breast', but then he euphemistically substitutes the nurse's 'capacity to produce milk' for 'her ability to nurse'. (Wiener, v.10, 285.)
[xli] The OED shows a 1950 example of 'to make love' : 'One of the Carvers made love to her and she had a baby.' Also, in Alan Lane's Penguin Dictionary of the English language, first published in 1970s, the meaning of 'to make love' as 'to woo' is classified as archaic.
[xlii] Maude 1929, 428.
[xliii] Richard Lourie has already commented on Pevear and Volokhonsky's excessive russicisms in dialogues in their translation of *Crime and Punishment*: when Marm eladov relates the depths to which he has fallen in regard to his wife, Pevear and Volokhonsky have him say 'I even drank up her stocking'. Lourie says: 'What? Did he start drinking champagne from her slipper and somehow end up imbibing her stockings? Or is this some perversion that managed to elude both Krafft-Ebing and Oprah Winfrey?' (Lourie 1992, 24)

[xliv] Amy Mandelker suggests that Anna and Vronsky's estate is English in custom, manner and style – 'English as it is perceived by Russian readers of English novels' (Mandelker 1993, 64-64.)
[xlv] This rhymed translation seems to be borrowed from Rochelle Townsend's version of *Anna Karenina* – see Townsend 1943, 33.
[xlvi] Both her husband and son were writers, among the family friends there were D. H. Lawrence, Joseph Conrad and John Galsworthy.
[xlvii] John Galsworthy. Introduction to *Anna Karenina,* Vol. 1. In Maude's translation of *Anna Karenina*, 1937, ix.
[xlviii] I would like to point out a more subtle example of what can be described as Pevear and Volokhonsky's 'excessive attention to the author's words, and too little to the characters' voices' (May 1994, 54). In part 5, chapter 1 Levin confesses to a priest who speaks 'быстрым владимирским на «о» говором' (Tolstoy v.9, 11.) In Russian that means pronouncing the letter o without stress as o – whilst it would be normally pronounced as a. In Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation the priest speaks 'in a quick, provincial patter with a stress on the *o*s'. The priest's words are; 'Doubts are in the nature of human weakness, but we must pray that God in His mercy will strengthen us. What particular sins do you have?' The problem is that this particular speech has hardly enough 'os' to imagine someone saying it with a stress on them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aaltonen, Sirkku (2000.) /*Time-sharing On Stage*/ Clevedon: Multilingual matters.

Abdulla, Adnan (1992.) *Translation of Style*/ /In Robert de Beaugrande, *Language, Discourse and Translation in the West and Middle East*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins publishing company: 65-72.

D'Ablancourt, Perrot (1972.) *Lettres Et Prefaces Critiques*/ Paris.

Ahnebrink, Lars (1961.) *The Beginnings of Naturalism in American Fiction 1891 – 1903/* New York: Russel & Russel, Inc.

Alexander, Michael (1997.) *Ezra Pound as Translator/ Translation & Literature* (6, 1): 23-30.

Alexandrov, Vladimir E (2004.) *Limits to Interpretation/* /The University of Wisconsin Press: Wisconsin

Alexeyev, M.P. (1964.) *William Ralston and Russian writers*/ In *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, volume 11, Oxford, Clarendon Press

Amos, Flora Ross (1920.) *Early Theories of Translation/* New York, Columbia University Press

Andreev, S.N. (2000) *Vyiavlenie stepeni shodstva originala I ego perevodov v poezii metodom diskriminantnogo analiza/ Universitetskoe perevodovedenie*/ Papers from the 1st All Russian academic conference "Fiodorovskie chteniia", October 27-28 1999 StPetersburg: Filologicheskii fakultet SPbGU: 12-18.

Armstrong, Judith (1988.) *The unsaid Anna Karenina* Hong Kong

Arnold, Matthew (1887.) *Count Lev Tolstoi*. In *The Fortnightly review* N247, 1 July: 783-793.

Arnold, Matthew (1905.) *On Translating Homer* London: John Murray.

Arrowsmith, W. and Shattuck, R. (1961) *The Craft and Context of Translation/* University of Texas Press.

Arutyunova, Nina (2000) *Naivnye razmyshleniya o naivnoy kartine mira*// *Iazyk o yazyke/* Moscow

Arvat, N.N. (1987.) *Slozhnoe Sintaksicheskoe Tseloe V Romane L.N. Tolstogo ''Anna Karenina''* In *Izuchenie iazyka proizvedenii L.N. Tolstogo*, Tula: Tulskii gosudarstvennyi pedagogicheskii institut im. LN Tolstogo: 117-126.

Aucouturier, Michel (1957) *Langage Interieur Et Analyse Psychologique Chez Tolstoj*. In *Revue des Etudes Slaves*, N34: 7-14.

Babaev, E.G (1961.) *Siuzhet I Kompozitsiia Romana ''Anna Karenina''*/ In *Tolstoy-hudozhnik*/ Moscow: Izdatelstvo Akademii nauk SSSR: 150-180.

Baker, Mona (1992) /*In other words: a coursebook on translation*. London: Routledge.

Baker, Mona and Malmkjaer, K. (1998) *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies/* London: Routledge.

Baker, Mona (2000) *Towards a Methodology for Investigating the style of a Literary Translator*. *Target* 12:2: 241-266.

Barnstone, Willis (1993) *The Poetics of Translatio./* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Bassnett, Susan (1996) *The Meek or the Mighty: Reappraising the Role of the Translator*. In: Alvarez, Roman, and Vidal, Carmen-Africa. /*Translation, Power, Subversion*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 10-24.

Bassnett, Susan (1991) *Translation Studies/ New Accents*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bassnett, Susan, and Lefevere, Andre (1998) *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bates, E.S. (1943)/ /*Intertraffic/* London: Jonathan Cape.

Bates, E.S. (1936)/ /*Modern Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.

Beaugrande, Robert de (1978)/ *Factors in a Theory of Poetic Translating* Assen: Van Gorcam.

Beekman, J. (1965) *Notes on Translation with Drills*/ Summer Institute of Linguistics, Santa Ana.

Bell, Anthea. (1996.) *Translating Asterix*/ /In Taylor, Jane, McMorran, Edith, Leclercq, Guy. *Translation: Here and There/ Now and Then*. Exeter: Elm Bank Publications: 125-138.

Belloc, Hilaire (1931) *On translation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Benjamin, Walter (2000) *The Task of the Translator*. In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, London and New York: Routledge: 15-25.

Bennett, Paul (1999) *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference, Lawrence Venuti. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. /210pp. Hb. ISBN 0-415-16929-1, £45; Pb. ISBN 0-415-16930-5, £15.99/ The Translator*, 5(2): 127-134.

Berman, Antoine (1984.) *L'epreuve de l'etranger*/ Cher: Gallimard.

Berman, Antoine (1995.) *Pour une critique des traductions: John Donne*. Paris: Gallimard.

Berman, Antoine (2000.) *Translation and the Trials of the Foreign*/ In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, London and New York: Routledge: 284-297.

Bernhofsky, Susan (1997.) *Schleiermacher's Translation Theory and Varieties of Foreignization/: The Translator* 3 (2): 175-192.

Between Languages and Cultures: translation and cross-cultural texts. Pittsburgh, London: University of Pittsburgh Press. 1995.

Bondarko, Aleksandr (1971.) *Vid I Vremia Russkogo Glagola/* Moscow: Prosveshenie.

Booth, Wayne (1983) *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Borges, Jorge Luis (2000) *The Translators Of The Thousand And One Nights.* In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, London and New York: Routledge: 34-48.

Borras, F. M., and Christian, R.F (1977.) */Russian Syntax* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Boyd, Brian (1991.) *Vladimir Nabokov /The American Years* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Boutcher, Warren (2000.) */The Renaissance*. /In *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, edited by Peter France. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 45-55.

Briggs, A. D. P. (2002) *I Come as a Thief: Notes on the Retranslation of War and Peace.* In *Tolstoy Studies Journal*: 100-108.

Brower, Reuben (1959) */Seven Agamemnons*/ In Reuben Brower *On translation* Cambridge: Harvard University Press: 173-195.

Brownlie, Siobhan (2003.) *Distinguishing Some Approaches to Translation Research*/ In */The Translator*, 9(1): 39-64.

Burgess, Anthony (1965.) *Pushkin & Kinbote/ Encounter* May: 74-78.

Burnley, J.D. (1989) *Late Medieval English Translation: Types And Reflections*. In *The Medieval Translator*, edited by Roger Ellis, Suffolk/ St Edmundsbury Press: 37-53

Burton, R.G. (1885a) *An Appreciation Of Russian Fictional Literature. Westminster Review*, volume CXLIV: 539-544.

Burton, R.G. (1885b) *The Censorship Of The Press In Russia. Westminster Review*, volume CXLIV: 134-140.

Campbell, Stuart (2000.) /*Choice Network Analysis in Translation Research. /A Causal Model for Translation Studies*. In *Intercultural faultlines*, edited by Maeve Olohan/ /Manchester, St Jerome Publishing 29-42.

Campbell, Stuart (1998.) /*Translation into the second language*. London: Longman.

Carballeira, Helena Miguelez (2003.) *Language And Characterization in Merce Rodoredas' 'La Placa del Diamant'*. In *The Translator*, 9 (1): 101-124.

Catford, J.C. (1965.) *A linguistic theory of translation*/ London

Chamberlain, Lori (1992.) /*Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation*/ In Lawrence Venuti, *Rethinking Translation*. London: Routledge: 57-74.

Chesterman, Andrew (2000.) *A Causal Model for Translation Studies*/ /In *Intercultural faultlines*, edited by Maeve Olohan. Manchester, St. Jerome Publishing 15-27.

Cheyfitz, Eric (1991.) *The Poetics Of Imperialism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Chicherin, Alexei (1968.) *Idei I Stil/* Moscow: Sovetskii Pisatel.

Chicherin, Alexei (1977.) *Ocherki Po Istorii Russkogo Literaturnogo Stilia*/ Moscow: Hudozhestvennaia Literatura.

Christian, R.F. (1978.) *Introduction/ /New essays on Tolstoy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1-13.

Christian, R.F. (1967) *Style in War and Peace.* In *Tolstoy*, edited by Ralph E. Matlaw/ Englewood Cliffs: New Jersey: 102-110.

Christian, R.F. (1969.) *Tolstoy/* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Christian, R.F. (1962) *Tolstoy's 'War and Peace': A Study*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Chusova, I.N. (1987.) *Leksicheskie Dialektismy V Avtorskoi Rechi L.N. Tolstogo/* /In *Izuchenie iazyka proizvedenii L.N. Tolstogo*, Tula: Tulskii gosudarstvennyi pedagogicheskii institut im. L.N. Tolstogo: 133-139

Classe, Olive (2000.) *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English*/ London: Fitzroy Dearborn.

Cluysenaar, Anne (1976.) *Introduction to Literary Stylistics*/ London: B.T. Batsford Limited.

Cohen, J.M. (1962.) *English translators and translations/* London: F.Mildner and Sons.

Corbett, John (2001) *The Seafarer: Visibility and Translation /Translation & Literature*/ 10, 2: 157-173.

Corbett, John (1999.) *Written in the Language of the Scottish Nation*/ Clevedon: Multilingual matters

Crankshaw, Edward (1947.) *Works of Constance Garnett* /*The listener*, 30.01: 195-196.

Crisafulli, Edoardo (1996.) *Dante's Puns in English and the Question of Compensation/ /The Translator*/ 2, 2: 259-276.

Crisafulli, Edoardo (2001.) *The adequate translator as a methodological tool/ Target*, 13:1: 1-28.

Davie, Donald (1990.) *Mr Tolstoy, I presume? The Russian Novel Through Victorian Spectacles*/ In *Slavic Excursions*. Manchester: Carcanet Press Limited, 271-280.

Davie, Donald (1965.) *Russian Literature And Modern English Fiction*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Davies, Eirlys (2003.) /*A Goblin or a Dirty Nose? /The Treatment of Culture-Specific References in Translations of the Harry Potter Books*. In *The Translator*, 9 (1): 65-100.

Delabastita, Dirk (1997.) *Essays on Punning and Translation/* Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Delisle, Jean, and Woodsworth, Judith. (1995) /*Translators through History/* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Derrida, Jacques (1985.) *Des Tours De Babel*/ /In Graham, Joseph. *Difference in Translation/* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985: 165-207.

Dneprov, Vladimir (1985.) *Iskusstvo chelokovedeniia*/ Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel.

Donskov, Andrew (1998.) *Tolstoj's Use Of Proverbs In The Power Of Darkness.* In McKenna, Kevin: *Proverbs In Russian Literature: From Catherine The Great To Alexander Solzhenitsyn*. Burlington: The University of Vermont: 61-74

Edwards, Oliver (1957a.) *Constance Garnett/ The Times,* June 6, 13

Edwards, Oliver (1957b.) *Cynara/ The Times*, July 11

El-Yasin, Mohammed K., and Al-Shehabat, Abdulla K (2005)/ /*Translating Proverbs*. Babel v.51, N2: 161-173.

Ellis, Roger (2000.) *The Middle Ages*/ In *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, edited by Peter France. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 39-45.

Emerson, Caryl (1988.) *Problems with Bakhtin's Poetics/ Slavic and East European Journal* 32: 503-525

Emerson, Caryl (1991.) *The Brothers, Complete*. Hudson Review 44: 309-16.

Emerson, Caryl (1985.)/ /*The Tolstoy Connection in Bakhtin*. PMLA 100: 68-80.

Enkvist, N.E. (1973.) *Discourse type, text type, and cross-cultural rhetoric*/ In Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit/ *Empirical Research in Translation and Intercultural Studies*. Tubingen: Gunter Narr Verlag: 5-16.

Ermilov, Vladimir (1963.) *Roman L.N. Tolstogo ''Anna Karenina''*/ Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatelstvo hudozhestvennoi literatury.

Eryomina, Liubov Ivanovna (1983.) *Rozhdenie Obraza/* Moscow: Nauka.

Eykhenbaum, Boris (1960.) *Lev Tolstoy*/ Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel.

Falchikov, Michael (2000.) *Twentieth-century fiction*/ In: *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, edited by Peter France. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 605-609.

Farghal, Mohammed (1992.) *Ideational Equivalence*/ In: Robert de Beaugrande, *Language, Discourse and Translation in the West and Middle East*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins publishing company: 55-63.

Flath, Carol (2002) *Anna Karenina: Translation, Literalism and the Life of Art*. In *Tolstoy Studies Journal*: 108-115.

Flotow, Louise (1997.) /*Translation and Gender*/ Manchester.

Fyodorov, Andrey (2002.) *Osnovy Obshey Teorii Perevoda*/ St Petersburg Filologia Tri

France, Peter (2000.) *Translation Studies and Translation Criticism*/ /In *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, edited by Peter France. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 3-10.

Frawley, William (2000.) *Prolegomenon To A Theory Of Translation*. In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, London and New York: Routledge: 250-263.

Frawley, William (1984.) *Translation: Literary, Linguistic and Philosophical Perspectives*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Gaddis Rose, Marilyn. (2000) *Twentieth-Century French Thinkers/* In *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, edited by Peter France/ Oxford: Oxford University Press: 296-300.

Galsworthy, John (1928.) /*Anna Karenina/ The Bookman*, 14: 243-245

Garnett, David (1973.) *Beany-eye*/ Chatto & Windus Ltd, London

Garnett, Richard (1991.) *Constance Garnett: A Heroic Life.* London: Sinclair-Stevenson.

Gentzler, E. (1993.) *Contemporary Translation Theories/ Translation Studies*/ London and New York: Routledge.

Gifford, Henry (1978.) *On translating Tolstoy/ New essays on Tolstoy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 17-38.

Gilmore, John (1999.) /*Tibullus and the British Empire. Graiger, Smollett and the Politics of Translation in the Mid-18th Century/ //The Translator*, 5 (1): 1-26.

Gornaia, Victoria (1961.) *Iz nabliudenii nad stilem romana ''Anna Karenina'' (O pushkinskih traditsiiah v romane*)/ In *Tolstoy-hudozhnik*. Moscow: Izdatelstvo Akademii nauk SSSR: 181-219.

Gornaia, Victoria (1970.) *Mir chitaet ''Annu Kareninu''*/ Moscow: Kniga.

Grace, George. (1987) *The linguistic construction of reality*. London: Croom Helm.

Graham, Joseph (1985.) *Difference in Translation*/ Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Graves, Robert. (1965.) *Moral Principles in Translation/ Encounter*, April: 47-55.

Grayson, Jane (1977.) *Nabokov translated*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Guillemin-Flescher, Jacqueline (1981.) *Syntaxe Comparee Du Francais Et De L'Anglais/* Paris: Ophrys.

Gusev, N.N. (1961) *Iz nabliudenii nad iazykom i stilem Tolstogo. (Zametki*)/ In *Tolstoy-hudozhnik*. Moscow: Izdatelstvo Akademii nauk SSSR: 430-461.

Gusev N.N. (1963.) *Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy*/ Moscow: Izdatelstvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.

Gustafson, Richard (1986.) *Leo Tolstoy Resident and Stranger/* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hale, Terry (2000.) *Romanticism And The Victorian Age.* In *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, edited by Peter France/ Oxford: Oxford University Press: 64-72.

Hardwick, Lorna (2000.) *Translating words, translating cultures*/ London: Duckworth

Hatim, Basil (1997.) *Communication Across Cultures// Translation Theory and Contrastive Text Linguistics*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

Hatim, Basil (2001.) *Teaching and Researching Translation*/ Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2001.

Hatim, Basil, and Mason, Ian (1990) *Discourse and the translator*/ Singapore: Longman.

Hatim, Basil, and Mason, Ian (1997) *The Translator as Communicator*/ London: Routledge

Heilbrun, Carolyn (1961) *The Garnett Family/* London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd

Hemmings, F.W.J. (1950) *The Russian Novel In France 1884-1914/* Oxford University Press

Hermans, Theo (1985) *The Manipulation of Literature/* London: Croom Helm

Hervey, Sandor, and Higgins, Ian (1992) *A course in translation method: French to English/* London and New York: Routledge.

Heylen, Romy (1993) *Translation, Poetics and the Stage*/ London: Routledge.

Hochel Brano (1991) *The Cross-Temporal and Cross-Spatial Factors and the Translation of Literary Language/* In *Translation Studies: the State of the Art*, edited by Kitty Van Leuven-Zwart and Tom Naajikens /Amsterdam: Rodopi: 41-48.

Hogan, Rebecca (1998.) ''Set Phrases Of Consolation And Exhortation'': Judging Proverbial And Biblical Wisdom In *Anna Karenina.* In McKenna, Kevin: *Proverbs In Russian Literature: From Catherine The Great To Alexander Solzhenitsyn*. Burlington: The University of Vermont: 75-89.

Hoffman, Eva (1989.) *Lost in translation/* New York: Penguin Books

Hofmann, Norbert (1980.) *Redundanz Und Aquivalenz In Der Literarischen Ubersetzung*. Tubingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Holman, M.J. de K. (1978) *The Purleigh Colony: Tolstoyan togetherness in the late 1890s. /New essays on Tolstoy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 194-222.

Holmes, James (1970.) *Forms of Verse Translation and the Translation of Verse Form/* In James Holmes, Frans de Haan and Anton Popovic/ /*The Nature of Translation*. The Hague: Mouton.

Holmes, James (1973-4.) *On Matching and Making Maps: From a Translator's Notebook.* Delta 16 (4): 67-82.

Holmes, James (1972) /*Rebuilding the Bridge at Bommel: Notes on the Limits of Translatability*/ In: *Dutch Quarterly Review of Anglo-American Letters*, 2: 65-72.

House, Juliane. *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*, Tubingen: Narr, 1977.

Humboldt, Wilhelm von (1988) /*On language*/ Cambridge

Hyde, G.M (1993) *The Whorf-Sapir Hypothesis and the Translation Muddle/ Translation and Literature* 2: 3-16.

Hymes, Dell (1964.) *Language in culture and society/ A reader in linguistics and anthropology*/ /New York.

Ilyas, Asim (1992.) *A Typology for Translation*/ /In: Robert de Beaugrande, *Language, Discourse and Translation in the West and Middle East. Amsterdam*, John Benjamins publishing company, 1992: 45-53.

Irwin, Robert (2000) The *Thousand And One Nights.* In *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, edited by Peter France/ Oxford: Oxford University Press: 149-152.

Jackson, Howard (1998.) /*Words and their meanings*/ London, New York, 1998.

Jacobsen, Eric (1958.) *Translation A Traditional Craft/* Copenhagen: Nordisk Forlag.

Jacobson, Roman (1960.) /*Linguistics and poetics*. In Thomas Sebeok, *Style of language/* Cambridge: Technology Press.

Jacobson, Roman (1959.) /*On Linguistic Aspects of Translation*. /In Reuben Brower. */On translation.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press: 232-239.

James, C. (1989) /*Genre analysis and the translator/ Target* 1:1.

Jarintzov, Nadine (1916.) /*The Russians and their language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Jezierski, Bronislas de L (1959) *Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature/* The University of North Carolina Studies in Comparative Literature: 84-85.

Jones, Gareth (2002) *Tolstoy staged in Paris, Berlin and London*. In *The Cambridge Companion to Tolstoy*, edited by Donna Tussing Orwin/ Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 142-157.

Jones, Malcolm (1978.) /*Problems of communication in Anna Karenina. /New essays on Tolstoy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 85-108.

Johnston, John (1992.) /*Translation as Simulacrum*. /In Venuti, *Rethinking translation*. London and New York: Routledge: 42-56.

Jurkowska-Krupa, Beata (1998.) *Modes Of Storytelling: A Rhetorical Analysis Of Film And Television Adaptations Of Arthur Conan Doyles's* <u>*The Hound of the Baskervilles*</u> *And Leo Tolstoy's* <u>*Anna Karenina*</u>: New York.

Katan, David (1999) *Translating cultures. An introduction for translators, interpreters and mediators*/ Manchester: St Jerome.

Kazakova, Tamara (2002) *Prakticheskie osnovy perevoda*/ St Petersburg: Soyuz.

Kelly, Catriona (2002) Leo Tolstoy: Anna Karenina, translated by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky. /Translation & Literature, 11, 2: 283-287.

Kelly, Catriona (2000.) *Tolstoy*/ /In *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, edited by Peter France. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 592-594.

Kelly, L.G (1979.) *The True Interpreter/ A History of Translation Theory and Practice in the West.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Kenny, Dorothy (2001.) *Lexis and creativity in translation/ A corpus-based study/* Manchester

Kent, Leonard (1964.) /*About theTranslation*. In *The Collected Tales and Plays of Nikolai Gogol,* translated by Constance Garnett, revised and edited by Leonard J.Kent, xi New York: Pantheon

Klimoff, Alexis (1973.) *Solzhenitsyn in English: An Evaluation*. In *Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn: Critical Essays and Documentary Materials*, edited by John Dunlop, Richard Hough, and Klimoff, 533-57/ Belmont: Nordland Publishing Co

Klitgard, Ida (2005.) *Taking the pun by the horns: the translation of wordplay in James Joyce's Ulysses/ Target*, v.17, issue 1: 71-92

Knapp, Liza (2003.) *Russian Editions and English Translations*/ In *Approaches to Teaching Tolstoy's Anna Karenina,* edited by Liza Knapp and Amy Mandelker: The Modern Language Association of America: New York: 37-46.

Knapp, Liza (2003.) *The Names*/ In *Approaches to Teaching Tolstoy's Anna Karenina,* edited by Liza Knapp and Amy Mandelker: The Modern Language Association of America: New York: 8-23.

Knight, Douglas (1959) *Translation: The Augustan Mode*. /In Reuben Brower/ *On translation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press: 196-204.

Knowles, A. V. (ed.)/ (1978) *Tolstoy/* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Knox, R.A (1958.) *Literary Distractions*/ London: Sheed and Ward.

Kochol, Viktor (1970.) /*The Problem of Verse Rhythm in Translation*/ In *The Nature of Translation*, edited by James S. Holmes/ Bratislava: Publishing House of the Slovak Academy of Sciences: 106-111.

Komissarov, V.N. (1980.) *Lingvistika perevoda/* Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia.

Kozhevnikova, N.A. (1987.) *O Tipah Povtora V Romane L.N. Tolstogo ''Anna Karenina*''. In *Izuchenie iazyka proizvedenii L.N. Tolstogo*, Tula: Tulskii gosudarstvennyi pedagogicheskii institut im. L.N. Tolstogo: 9-17.

Krasnianskii, V.V. (1987.) *Nestandartnaia Leksika V Hudozhestvennoi I Nehudozhestvennoi Rechi L.N. Tolstogo*/ /In *Izuchenie iazyka proizvedenii L.N. Tolstogo*, Tula: Tulskii gosudarstvennyi pedagogicheskii institut im. L.N. Tolstogo: 3-9.

Krupnov, Viktor (1976.) /*V tvorcheskoi laboratorii perevodchika*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia.

Kuroczycki, Tadeusz (1977.) /*Z Problematyki Rosyjsko-Polskiego Przekladu Artystycznego.* Poznan: wydawniwstwo naukowe uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu

Kwiesinski, Piotr (1998.) *Translation Strategies in a Rapidly Transforming Culture*// In: *The Translator* 4(2): 183-206.

Larbaud, Valery (1997) /*Sous l'invocation de saint Jerome*/ Paris: Gallimard.

Latham, E. (1927.) *Traduttore, traditore*/ In: *The Author*.

Lefevere, Andre (1992a) *Translation/ History/ Culture: A source book*. London and New York: Routledge.

Lefevere, Andre (1992b) /*Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge.

Leighton, Lauren (1984.) *The Art Of Translation. Kornei Chukovsky's A High Art.* Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press.

Leighton, Lauren (1991.) *Two worlds, one art*/ Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press.

Leong, Albert (1971.) *Leo Tolstoy/ Anna Karenina/ The Maude Translation, Background and Sources, Essays in Criticism/ Edited by George Gibian. (Norton Critical Editions) New York: W.W. Norton, 1970, xvi, 920, $3.45. Slavic and East European Journal*, spring 71-73.

Leppihalme, Ritva. (1997) *Culture bumps. An Empirical Approach to the Translations of Allusions/* Clevedon

Leontiev, Konstantin (1965.) *Analiz, Stil I Veyanie*/ Providence: Brown University Press.

Levitskaia, Tatiana (1945.) *Ob adekvatnosti perevodov na osnove 4 perevodov "Voiny i mira" Tolstogo na angliiskii iazyk* (a candidate dissertation)/ Moscow.

Levitskaia, Tatiana, Fiterman, Ada (1976) *Problemy perevoda*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia.

Lev Tolstoy Ob Iskusstve I Literature (1958)/ V.2/ Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel

Lewis, Philip (1985) *The Measure of Translation Effects.* In *Difference in Translation/* edited by Joseph Graham, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 31-62.

L.N. Tolstoy Perepiska S Russkimi Pisateliami (1962.) Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatelstvo Khudozhestvennoi Literatury.

Lodge, David. (1992) *The Art of Fiction*. London: Penguin Books.

Logicheskii analiz iazyka/ Obraz cheloveka v kulture i iazyke/ Moscow: Indrik, 1999.

Lomunov, K.N. (1961.) *Shkola Vysokogo Masterstva*/ /In *Tolstoy-hudozhnik*. Moscow: Izdatelstvo Akademii nauk SSSR: 7-44.

Lourie, Richard (1992.) *Raskolnikov says the darnedest things*/ *New York Times Book Review,* 26 April: 24.

Low, Frances H. (1911.) *Anna Karenina: An Appreciation*. *The Fortnightly Review*, July – December, 728-744

Lyngstad, Alexandra (1972.) *Tolstoj's Use of Parentheses in War and Peac/. Slavic and East European Journal*, v.16 (4): 403-413.

Lyons, John (1980.) *Pronouns of address in Anna Karenina: the stylistics of bilingualism and the impossibility of translation*. In: *Studies In English Linguistics For Randolph Quirk*, edited by Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. New York, Longman: 235-249.

Mandelker, Amy (1993.) *Framing Anna Karenina*/ Ohio State University Press

Mandelker, Amy (1989.) *Re-reading Tolstoy: New Directions In Tolstoy Scholarship*. /In *Tolstoy Studies Journal*, volume 2: 87-96.

Mason, Ian. (1992) *Discourse, Ideology and Translation*/ /In Robert de Beaugrande, *Language, Discourse and Translation in the West and Middle East*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins publishing company: 23-34.

Mason, Tom. (2000.) *Lyric Poetry*/ /In *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, edited by Peter France. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 513-516.

Matthiessen, F.O (1931.) *Translation An Elizabethan Art*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Matlaw, Ralph (1976.) *The Brothers Karamazov/ /By Fyodor Dostoevsky, translated by Constance Garnett*. New York: Norton.

Matlaw, Ralph (1967.) *Tolstoy/* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Maude, Aylmer (1904) *A Peculiar People The Doukhobors*. London: Grant Richards.

Maude, Aylmer (1924) *The Authorized Life Of Marie C. Stopes*. London: Williams & Norgate, LTD.

Maude, Aylmer (1929.) */The life of Tolstoy/ First fifty years*. London: Humphrey Milford.

May, Rachel. (1994) *The Translator in the Text*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

McKenna, Kevin (1998.) *'One Does Not Dispute A Proverb, Argue With A Fool, Or With The Truth': An Introduction To The Use Of Proverbs In Russian Literature*. In McKenna, Kevin: *Proverbs In Russian Literature: From Catherine The Great To Alexander Solzhenitsyn.* Burlington: The University of Vermont: 1-6.

McLean, Hugh (2002.) *Reply / Tolstoy Studies Journal*: 117-118.

McLean, Hugh (2001.) */Which English Anna?* In *Tolstoy Studies Journal*: 38-48.

Medvedeva, L.A. (1978.) *Slozhnye prilagatelnye v proizvedeniiah L .N. Tolstogo/* In *Lev Tolstoy: Problemy Tvorchestva*/ Kiev: Visha shkola: 264-272

Morgan, Bayard Quincy (1959.) *A Critical Bibliography of Works on Translation/* In Brower, *On Translation*/ Cambridge: Harvard University Press: 271-297.

Morson, Gary Saul (1988.) *Hidden In Plain View/ Narrative and Creative Potentials in ''War and Peace*''. Aldershot: Scolar Press.

Moser, Charles (1988.) *The Achievement of Constance Garnett/ American Scholar*, summer: 431-38.

Motyleva, Tatiana (1978.) "*Voina i mir" za rubezhom/* Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel.

Mounin, Georges (1963.) *Problemes Theroretiques de la Traduction/* /Paris, 1963.

Munday, Jeremy (2001.) *Introducing translation studies: theories and applications/* London: Routledge.

Murray, J. Middleton (1922.) *The Problem Of Style*. Oxford: Humphrey Milford Oxford University Press.

Nabokov, Vladimir (1981.) *Lectures on Russian literature/* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Nabokov, Vladimir (2000.) *Problems Of Translation: "Onegin" in English*. In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, London and New York: Routledge: 71-83.

Nabokov, Vladimir (1959.) *The servile path*/ In Brower, *On Translation*/ Cambridge: Harvard University Press: 97-110.

Newman, Francis (1856.) *The Iliad of Homer/* London: Walton and Maberly.

Newman, Francis (1853.) *The Odes Of Horace*. London: John Chapman, 1853.

Newmark, Peter (1981.) *Approaches to translation/.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Nida, Eugene (1959.) /*Principles of Translation as Exemplified by Bible Translating*/ In Reuben Brower// *On Translation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959: pp. 11-31.

Nida, Eugene (1964.) *Toward a science of translating/* Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1964.

Nida, Eugene and Charles Taber (1969) *The Theory of Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill.

Olesha, Iurii (1965.) *Ni Dnia Bez Strochk/.* Moscow: Sovetskaia Rossiia.

Olshanskaya, Natalya (1992.) *Rhythmic Patterns in Fiction and Their Representation in Translation/ In Translation And Meaning*, edited by Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and Marcel Thelen. Maastricht: Rijkhogesschool Maastricht: 219-226.

Opulskaia, L. D. (1961.) *Psihologicheskii Analiz V Romane ''Voskresenie''*/ In *Tolstoy-hudozhnik* Moscow: Izdatelstvo Akademii nauk SSSR: 314-343.

Orel, Harold (1977) *The Victorian View of Russian Literature*. *Victorian Newsletter*, 51: 1-5.

Ortega y Gasset, Jose (2000.) *The Misery And The Splendor Of Translation* /In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, London and New York: Routledge, 2000: 49-64.

Osgood, Charles (1960.) *Some Effects of Motivation on Style of Encoding*/ /In Thomas Sebeok, *Style in Language*. The Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology: 293-306.

Pannwitz, Rudolph (1947.) *Die Krisis der Europaischen Kultur*. Nurnberg: Verlag Hans Carl.

Parks, Tim. (1998). *Translating Style*. Cassell: London.

Parthe, Kathleen (1982.) *Death Masks in Tolstoi/ Slavic Review* 41: 297-305.

Pawley, Andrew (1987.) *Encoding events in Kalam and English*. In Russell Tomlin: *Coherence and grounding in discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Penson, J.H. (1923) *Translations And the Need of Guidance.* In *The Author*, April: 75-76.

Peterson, Dale (1992.) *Justifying the margin: the Construction of "Soul" in Russian and African-American texts/ Slavic Review*, 51

Pevear, Richard (2000.) *Being true to the Russian Master*. In *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 15 December: vi/

Pevear, Richard, and Volokhonsky, Larissa (2001) *Translators' Note/.* In Leo Tolstoy, *Anna Karenina,* Translated by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky/ London: Penguin Books: xvi-xvii.

Phelps, Gilbert (1956) *The Russian Novel In English Fiction*. London, Hutchinson and Co, 19

Phillips, J.B. (1953.) *Some personal reflections on New Testament translation/ The Bible Translator*, 4

Polubichenko, Lydia (1984.) */Philological Topology and the Translation of Fiction. Quinquereme*, 7.2

Poole, Adrian (2000) *Aeschylus*/ /In *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, edited by Peter France. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000: 356-360.

Pound, Ezra. *Guido's Relations*. In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti/ London and New York: Routledge, 2000: 26-33

Pound, Ezra. *The Translations of Ezra Pound*/ London: Faber and Faber, 1954.

Proffer, Carl. (1964.) *Dead Souls in Translation/ Slavic and East European Journal*; 8.4: 420-433

Prozorova, Liubov (1992.) /*Functional Sentence Perspective in Seven Translations of Anna Karenina*. *Meta*, 37/1: 27-138

Pursglove, Michael (1972) *The smiles of Anna Karenina. Slavic and East European Journal*, 42-48.

Pym, Anthony (2000) *Late Victorian To The Present*. In *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, edited by Peter France/ Oxford: Oxford University Press: 73-81.

Pym, Anthony (1998.) *Method in Translation History*/ Manchester: StJerome Publishing, 1998.

Pym, Anthony (1995.) /*Schleiermacher and the Problem of Blendlinge. Translation and Literature*, 1995, 4: 5-30.

Pym, Anthony (1996.) *Venuti's Visibility /Target*, 8:1: 165-177.

Rabinowitz, Peter (1988.) *Before Reading/* Ohio State University Press

Raffel, Burton (1994.) *The art of translating prose*/ Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Rannie, David Watson (1915.) *The Elements of Style*/ London: J.M. Dent & Sons.

Rapoport, Semion (1928.) *Translations and Translators/ /Contemporary Review,* 133, 1928: 500-508.

Reid, Robert (1986.) T*he Critical Uses of Translation (Lermontov's A Hero of Our Time). Essays in Poetics*/ 11.2: 55-90.

Reiss, Katharina (1971.) *Moglichkeiten und Grenzen der Ubersetzungskritik: Kategorien und Kriterien fur eine sachgerechte Beurteilung von Ubersetzungen.* Munich.

Rener, Frederick (1989.) *Language and Translation from Cicero to Tyler*/ Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi.

Robinson, Douglas (1997a.) *Becoming a Translator/* London: Routledge.

Robinson, Douglas (1993.) *Decolonizing Translation/ Translation and Literature*: 2: 113-124.

Robinson, Douglas (1997b.) *Translation and Empire*/ Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

Robinson, Douglas (1999.) *Translation and taboo*/ Northern Illinois University Press

Robinson, Douglas (1991) *The Translator's Turn/* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.

Rose, Marilyn Gaddis (1997) *Translation and Literary Criticism*/ Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

Rosslyn, Felicity (2000.) *Homer And Other Epics*. In *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, edited by Peter France/ Oxford: Oxford University Press: 350-356.

Sankovitch, Natasha (1998.) *Creating and Recovering Experience/ /Repetitions in Tolstoy*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Sapir, Edward (1949.) *Selected writings of Edward Sapir in language, culture and personality/* Ed.: David Mandelbaum. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Savory, T.H. (1957) *The Art of Translation*/ London: Jonathan Cape

Schleiermacher, Friedrich (1963) *Uber die verschiedenen Methoden des Ubersetzens*. In *Das Problem des Ubersetzens*, edited by Hans Joachim Storig/ Darmstadt: 38-70

Schultze, Sydney (1982.) *The Structure Of Anna Karenina.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis.

Shaffer, E.S. (1984.) */Translation as metamorphosis and cultural transmission/* In *Comparative Criticism: An Annual Journal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schaffner, Christina, and Kelly-Holmes, Helen (1995) */Cultural Functions of Translation/* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Shamma, Tarek (2005.) *The Exotic Dimension of Foreignizing Strategies/ /Burton's Translation of the Arabian Nights. The Translator*, v.11, N 1: 51-67.

Shaw, George Bernard (1922.) *The works of Tolstoy*/ /In: *The Author*: 292-293.

Sheldon, Richard (2002.) *More Problems in English Translations of Tolstoy*/ In: *Tolstoy Studies Journal*: 115-117.

Sheldon, Richard (1997) *Problems in the Translation of Anna Karenina*/ In: *Essays in the art and theory of translation*, edited by Lenore A. Grenoble and John M. Kopper. New York: The Edwin Mellen Press: 231-261.

Shifman, A. I. (1961.) *Hudozhestvennye Elementy V Publitsistike L. N. Tolstogo*/ In: *Tolstoy-hudozhnik*. Moscow: Izdatelstvo Akademii nauk SSSR: 397-429.

Schlegel, A. W. (1995.) *A.W. Schlegel on the German Homer /Translation and Literature*, 4: 113-117.

Schogt, Henry (1988.) */Linguistics, Literary Analysis, and Literary Translation.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Shklovskii, Viktor (1970.) *Material I Stil V Romane Lva Tolstogo "Voina I Mir*"/ The Hague: Mouton.

Shveitser, Alexandr (1988.) *Teoriia perevoda: status, problemy, aspekty*. Moscow: Nauka

Simmons, Ernest J (1973.) *Tolstoy*/ London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Simon, S. (1996.) *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission.* London: Routledge.

Smith, J. A. (1939) *Tolstoy's Fiction in England And America*. /PhD thesis. Urbana: Illinois.

Snell (-Hornby), Mary. (1978.) /*German-English Prose Translation*/ Munchen: Max Hueber.

Snell-Hornby, Mary, Jettmarova Z and Kaindl K (1995) /*Translation as International Communication/* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Snell-Hornby, Mary (1988.) *Translation studies/* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Snell-Hornby, Mary (1983.) /*Verb-descriptivity in German and English*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Sowerby, Robin (2000.) *Virgil*/ /In *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, edited by Peter France. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 507-512.

Stabler, Jane (1995) /*The Genesis of Byron's Hints from Horace/ Translation and Literature*, 1995, 4: 47-65

Steiner, George (1975.) *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Steiner, T.R. (1975.) *English Translation Theory/* Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, Assen.

Storig, Hans (1973) *Das Problem des Ubersetzens*, Darmstadt: Wiss. /Buchgesellschaft.

Studneva, A. I. (1987.) *Pushkinskie Sintaksicheskie Tendentsii V Hudozhestvennoi Proze L.N. Tolstogo*/ In: *Izuchenie iazyka proizvedenii L.N. Tolstogo*, Tula: Tulskii gosudarstvennyi pedagogicheskii institut im. L.N. Tolstogo: 126-132

Sturge, Kate (2003.) *Censorship of Translated Fiction in Nazi Germany/ /TTR*, 15: 153-171.

Sumera, Adam (1992.) *Names in Literary Translations/* In *Translation And Meaning,* edited by Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and Marcel Thelen. Maastricht: Rijkhogesschool Maastricht: 227-231.

Tancock, L.W. (1958.) *Some problems of style in translation from French/* /In Forster/ *Aspects of Translation*.

Taylor, Jane, McMorran, Edith, Leclercq, Guy (1996.) *Translation: Here and There. /Now and Then.* Exeter: Elm Bank Publications.

Terry, Arthur (2000.) *Cervantes*/ In: *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation,* edited by Peter France. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 55-64.

The Poems of Catullus and Tibullus and The Vigil Of Venus. (1897) London: George Bell and Sons.

The pragmatics of translation (1998.) Clevedon

Tolstoy, Sergey (1957) *Osnovy perevoda s angliyskogo iazyka na russkii*. /Moscow.

Toury, Gideon (1995) /*Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond*/ Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Toury, Gideon (1980a) *In Search of a Theory of Translation*/ Tel-Aviv: Porter Institute.

Toury, Gideon (1980b) //*The Translator as a Nonconformist-to-be, or: How to Train Translators So As to Violate Translational Norms*// In: S.O. Poulsen and W. Wilss. *Angewandte Ubersetzungswissenschaft. Internationales ubersetzungswissenschaftliches Kolloquium an der Wirtschaftsuniversitat Arhus*, Danemark, Arhus

Translation and nation: toward a cultural politics of Englishness/ Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Translation/history/culture: a sourcebook. (1992) London: Routledge.

The Translation of Culture: essays to E. E. Evans-Pritchard. (1971) London: Tavistock Publications.

The Translator's Art, edited by William Radice and Barbara Reynolds. (1987) Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Turner, C.J.G. (1993) *A Karenina Companion*/ Waterloo, Wilfrid University Press

Tymoczko, Maria (2000.) *Translation and Political Engagement/* In: *The Translator*, 6 (1): 23-47.

Tymoczko, Maria (1999.) /*Translation in a Postcolonial Context*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Tytler, Alexander Fraser (1978.) *Essays on the Principles of Translation/* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Van den Broeck, Raymond. (1981) /*The limits of translatability exemplified by metaphor translation/ Poetics Today*, 4.

Venuti, Lawrence (2000a) *Neoclassicism And Enlightenment.* In *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, edited by Peter France/ Oxford: Oxford University Press: 55-64.

Venuti, Lawrence (1992.) *Rethinking Translation/* London: Routledge.

Venuti, Lawrence (1986.) *The Translator's Invisibility* /In *Criticism,* 28, 2: 179-212

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

Venuti, Lawrence (1998a) *The Scandals of Translation*. London: Routledge.

Venuti, Lawrence (1998b.) /*Translation and minority*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

Venuti, Lawrence (2000b.) *The translation studies reader*. London: Routledge.

Vermeer, Hans (2000.) *Skopos and Commission*/ In: *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti. London and New York: Routledge, 2000: 221-232.

Vermeer, Hans (1986.) *Ubersetzen als kultureller Transfer*. /In Mary Snell-Hornby, *Ubersetzungswissenschaft – Eine Neuorientierung.*

Vinay, Jean-Paul, and Darbelnet, Jean (2000) *A Methodology For Translation*. /In Venuti, Lawrence. *The translation studies reader.* London: Routledge: 84-93.

Vinogradov, Viktor (1939.) *O iazyke Tolstogo*/ Literaturnoe nasledstvo, v.35-36/ Moscow: Izdatelstvo AN SSSR.

Vinogradov, Viktor (1949.) *Ocherki Po Istorii Russkogo Literaturnogo Iazyka XVII-XIX vv.* Leiden: E. I. Brill.

Wachtel, Andrew (2002.) *History and autobiography in Tolstoy*/ /In *The Cambridge Companion to Tolstoy*, edited by Donna Tussing Orwin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 176-190.

Wedgwood, Julia (1887.) *Count Leo Tolstoj. Contemporary Review,* 52: 249-262.

Weissbort, Daniel (2000.) *Poetry*/ In: *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, edited by Peter France. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 89-96.

Wierzbicka, Anna (1992.) *Semantics, culture and cognition/ /Universal human concepts in culture-specific configurations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, Gareth (1990.) *The Influence Of Tolstoy On Readers Of His Works/* Studies in Slavic Language and Literature, Volume 4. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Wilson, Penelope (1982.) *Classical Poetry and the Eighteenth-Century Reader*/ In: Isabel Rivers, *Books and their Readers in Eighteenth Century England*. Leicester, Leicester University Press.

Wilss, Wolfram (1996.) /*Knowledge and Skills in Translator Behavior*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Woolf, Virginia (1966.) *The Russian Point of View/* /In *Collected Essays*, v.1. London: Chatto & Windus, 238-246.

Worth, Valerie (1988) *Practising Translation in Renaissance France/* Oxford: Calendon Press.

Zgusta, Ladislav (1984.) *Translational equivalence in the bilingual dictionary*/ In R.R.K. Hartmann, *LEXeter* '83 Proceedings, /Tubingen: Niemeyer.

Zhdanov, Vladimir (1957.) *Tvorcheskaia istoriya ''Anny Kareninoi*'' Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel.

Zhislina, S (1961.) *Istoriia Odnoi Skazki/ In: Tolstoy-hudozhnik.* Moscow: Izdatelstvo Akademii nauk SSSR: 207-219.