

УДК 82.161.1=030

## “Strong” Texts of Russian Culture and Centers of Translation Attraction

Veronica A. Razumovskaya\*

Siberian Federal University  
79 Svobodny, Krasnoyarsk, 660041, Russia

Received 15.01.2014, received in revised form 31.01.2014, accepted 18.04.2014

*The article is devoted to the emergence of the centers of translation attraction in the result of generation of secondary translation texts by “strong” literary originals. The Russian original text of “Eugene Onegin” and its foreign languages translations, which were created and published in 19-21<sup>st</sup> centuries, are the research material of the article. The “strong” text is studied from the position of the concept of literocentrism, which is of great importance for the Russian culture, and also by using the relatively new category of translation multiplicity. The combination of literature and translation studies aspects provides the complementary approach towards the under study problem.*

*Keywords: literary translation, center of translation attraction, literocentrism, Russian literature, translation multiplicity, “Eugene Onegin”.*

### Introduction

Every national culture and, consequently, every national literature has a body of key literary texts, providing both: the preservation and further development of its national literary and cultural traditions and mutually beneficial cross-cultural interaction and influence of different national cultures and literary traditions. In some cases, it is a set of literary texts that form the core of a definite culture, which is a repository and a transmitter of cultural information and, most importantly, cultural memory – a special kind of cultural information, characterized by an over-individual nature reflecting the most significant past, common to a particular people, nation, or even the majority of humanity (Assmann 1968). The core texts contain basic information about “their” cultures in a situation of intercultural

interaction and cultural exchange and this is what makes it a literocentric culture. The concept of literocentrism is in general based on the culture’s persistent gravity towards the literary and verbal forms of self-representation (Kondakov 1992), on an understanding of literature as a primary storage for core values in a particular cultural community (Lotman 1998), on a special status of literary texts in the cultural space. Literocentrism implies recognition of a particular high status of literature in a definite national culture, an indisputable power of the literary word.

### Literocentrism of Russian Culture and its Reflection in “Other” Texts

A bright example of a literocentric (“text-centric” by Yu.M. Lotman) culture is the Russian one, although the literocentrism is typical not

only for this culture but for other cultures around the world in certain periods of their history (Kondakov 2008). Literocentrism is traditionally defined as a meta-historical feature of Russian culture: the literocentric model was formed in a particular information environment, determined by a specific type of Russian mentality, by peculiarities of the Russian character. Being a unique phenomenon, literocentrism dominated Russian culture for two centuries, from the time of prosperity and the rule of literocentrism (time space between Karamzin and Gorky) to its crisis and decline. Considering dimensions of the crisis of the Russian literocentrism, I.V. Kondakov comes to an important conclusion that the stages of the crisis reflect such a property of Russian culture as cyclic recurrence (Kondakov 1994).

In various cycles of development of Russian culture literary texts traditionally served and are serving to the purpose of keeping Russian cultural identity and implementation of intercultural exchange between Russian and other cultures of the world. Through the texts of A.S. Pushkin, F.M. Dostoevsky, L.N. Tolstoy, A.P. Chekhov, A.I. Solzhenitsyn and many other representatives of the Russian classics "other" cultures try to learn the "mysterious Russian soul", to understand the Russian mentality and Russian character, to get acquainted with the peculiarities of Russian life, to learn the unique phenomena of Russian culture and Russian history in its significant events since ancient times.

One of the possible evidences of the inherent literocentrism of Russian culture is a regular quoting of Russian literary texts in texts of "other" cultures, which is reflected in special reference publications. Thus, one of the largest modern English dictionaries is Oxford Dictionary of Quotations – ODQ: the first edition was published in 1941 and the last to date, the seventh – in 2009 (The Oxford Dictionary 2009). The main dictionary contains

over 20,000 quotations from 3500 authors belonging to different countries, cultures and eras. In the seventh edition the Russian sources are presented by 184 quotations from 49 authors. Among the cited authors the vast majority (29 persons) are Russian writers. The dictionary includes citations, the authorship of which belongs to the famous Russian prose writers (A.P. Chekhov, F.M. Dostoevsky, N.V. Gogol, A.I. Solzhenitsyn, L.N. Tolstoy, and I.S. Turgenev) and poets (A.A. Akhmatova, O.E. Mandelstam, V.V. Mayakovsky, B.L. Pasternak, A.S. Pushkin, S.A. Yesenin). Citations of Russian authors are also represented by political and public figures of Russia: Alexander II, Catherine the Great, V.I. Lenin, J.V. Stalin, L.D. Trotsky, B.N. Yeltsin, etc. The amount listed in the dictionary of quotations from non-literary sources is two times less than that of literary texts (15). Other authors of the included in the edition quotations were Russian scientists and people of art (A.D. Sakharov, S.P. Diagilev, I.F. Stravinsky). Thus, 75% of all the quotes with Russian cultural origin in the dictionary were written by writers and poets, which vividly shows the obvious literocentrism of Russian culture (Urzhumova).

The analysis of portrayals of Russian culture in another famous British lexicographical edition (fourth edition of the Little Oxford Dictionary of Quotations – LODQ 2008) also leads to the conclusion about the features of the formation of Russia's image in the minds of educated English speakers (Polubichenko 2010). And one of these features will be a representation of Russian culture predominantly through the Russian literary texts.

In ODQ and LODQ quotes of Russian culture are represented, of course, not in the original form of the Russian language, they were translated into the English version of the form, which serves as a secondary source (translated texts) of Russian literature.

### **"Strong Texts", Textual Grids and Literary Translation**

Russian literature has traditionally been in a kind of cultural crossroads between East and West, occupying a special place in the world's cultural and literary space. Russian literary texts are involved into the intensive translation process going "westwards" and "eastwards", which requires effective translation solutions aimed at preserving cultural information and memory of original texts in the translations created by translators. Translation objectives and strategies can be of general and of special character depending on the cultural and typological features of languages involved in the translation process. I.V. Kondakov notes that one of the features of Russian culture in the aspect of cross-cultural interaction with the West and the East is a direct or indirect reflection of this interaction in the texts of Russian culture and literature, which "tend to lead an intercultural dialogue, the interaction and synthesis of various ethnic and cultural influences and intentions" (Kondakov 2008: 5).

Literary texts that form the core of a particular culture can be defined as "strong" texts (Kuzmina 2009). N.A. Kuzmina points out that "strong" texts are known to most native speakers, and determine the canon of individual and school-university education, characterized by the embedded ability to be re-interpreted – "translatability" into languages of other arts (subject to "intersemiotic" translation by R. Jakobson). If the concept of "strong" text was proposed in context of the developed in modern philology theory of intertextuality, when, considering issues of literary translation, the leader of "the manipulation school" A. Lefevere among the objects of literary translation also allocated a special type of such texts, which are national and world cultural heritage ("cultural capital" in terms of the scholar). According to the American translation scholar culturally

significant literary texts are in the permanent system of communication and interaction that suggests the existence of a particular text system-structural heterogeneous formation formed by important national literary texts, and by texts that are considered to world cultural heritage. A. Lefevere argues that literary texts characterized as cultural heritage, form textual grids within certain cultures; these cultural grids are located, according to the researcher, regardless of language planes of cultures and are preceded in a certain way to these planes. With such features as required artificiality, historicity, convention, variability and incomprehensibility, textual grids are absorbed by the carriers of the "own" culture to such an extent that they are perceived as "natural" (Bassnett, Lefevere 1998: 5).

The concept of "strong text" is comparable with the concept of "absolute picture". The term "absolute picture" was proposed by representatives of the Moscow conceptual school of art to denote canvases, without which it is impossible to imagine the history of art as a wide pan-European or global culture phenomenon ("Mona Lisa" and "The Last Supper" by Leonardo da Vinci, "Sistine Madonna" by Raphael), and within the individual national cultures ("Trinity" by Andrei Rublev, "Alyonushka" by Victor Vasnetsov, "Morning in a Pine Forest" by Ivan Shishkin, "Bathing of a Red Horse" by Kuzma Petrov-Vodkin for Russian culture). These "absolute pictures" with maximum completeness and expressiveness accumulate the collective conscious and collective unconscious (Monastyrsky 1999). "Strong" texts have high energy potential, have a large audience of readers. It is believed that "strong" texts constantly give their energy to readers and get the additional energy from the readers, which is magnified due to the emerging information resonance.

Arguing about the text and cultural grids in the context of literary translation study,

A. Lefevere claims that "strong" texts (the key texts of a culture) are located at the nodes of text and cultural grids, which provides stability and persistence of cultures, a certain "rigidity" of their structures. In this case, the recognition of existence of these textual and cultural grids is to a certain extent consonant to some fairly recent concepts such as the language matrix of a culture (Karasik 2013), the archetypal matrix of a culture (Lubavin 2002), the value-normative matrix (Zapesotsky 2013). The new concept of cultural matrix and, in particular, the Russian cultural matrix is also an "umbrella" term, which probabilities and possibilities of existence today is reflected by representatives of different areas of knowledge (Arkhangelsky 2012).

"Strong" texts are the most regular objects in a special field of translation studies – literary translation. The category of "strong" texts, undoubtedly, includes such novels as "Crime and Punishment" by F.M. Dostoevsky, "Eugene Onegin" by A.S. Pushkin, "The Master and Margarita" by M.A. Bulgakov, "Doctor Zhivago" by B.L. Pasternak, "The Twelve Chairs" by I. Il'f and E. Petrov and some other prosaic and poetic literary texts of Russian culture. The significance of literary texts for understanding the Russian culture is difficult to overestimate. So, M. Lipovetsky, referring to the origins of the new literary thinking, writes: "Do not the Bible, Homer, 'The Divine Comedy' or 'Eugene Onegin' embrace the whole world, each time making it in a new way? And does not every true work build a shaped model of the whole universe as a whole?" (Lipovetsky).

The history of literary translation is a convincing evidence that a culturally and aesthetically significant literary text regularly tends to self-recurrence and generates numerous foreign-language (and often intersemiotic) variants, creating extensive centers of translation attraction. The translation center of attraction

has an obvious field structure. The literary original text is the core-stimulus in the field of translatability, which includes the central part comprising all already created and existing actual foreign-language translations. The peripheral part is represented by translations, which became irrelevant because of their obsolescence or low quality. The potential part of the field of translatability combines hypothetically possible translations of the original text, which may appear in the future. One cannot but agree with Yu.M. Lotman that "strong" literary texts do not only act as constant passive repositories of information, because they are not warehouses but generators (Lotman 1998); in its turn, the cultural memory, presented in literary texts, is also not a passive repository, making it an important part of the text-shaping mechanism of a culture.

The ability of "strong" texts to be self-recurrent is due to their information potential. The aesthetic information, cultural information and, above all, cultural memory shape the content of a literary text: the content which is un-detailed, un-manifested, indescribable, and as a consequence – ambiguous. The information ambiguity implies the decoding ambiguity of the text content in the process of understanding and creates unlimited possibilities for interpreting of the current content in the perception of the original text by "our" reader (reader belonging to the original culture) and in decoding the text by the translator in the translation process.

### **The Literary Original Text and Literary Translation: Issues of Translation Multiplicity**

An original literary text is a complex systemic structural formation with the openness to imitation and the ability to be continued in "our" and "their" linguocultures. The "imitativeness" and "continuability" of a literary text are due, above all, to its information

ambiguity, which is one of the most important characteristics of the mandatory information of the artistic text and one of the categories of literary translation. It is the ambiguity of aesthetic information that generates numerous interpretations of information of a certain literary text within its own culture and language when the literary texts are perceived by readers belonging to the domestic language-culture. Ambiguity underlies the basis of the categories, which have recently expanded the categorical paradigm of literary translation: original inexhaustibility and translation multiplicity. The representatives of Magadan translation school made a significant contribution to the creation and development of a theory of translation multiplicity. Arguing with literary critic and translator Yu.D. Levin, who defines multiplicity in translation as "the possible existence in the national literature of several translations of a foreign-language literary work, which has one original, as a rule, embodiment of the text" (Levin 1992: 213), R.R. Tchaikovsky did not agree with the possibility of existence of several literary translations of the original in the "current national literature" and proposes to consider the phenomenon of translation multiplicity in the context of translated literature as an obvious fact of the existence of a "third literature", which holds an intermediate position between the foreign language literature and literature of the target language ("domestic" literature). However, different perspectives on the phenomenon of translation multiplicity do not question such important categorical attributes of literary translation as derivativeness (secondariness), synchronicity and diachronicity, inexhaustibility of the original text. In the monograph "The Inexhaustible Original: 100 Translations of 'Panther' by R.M. Rilke into 15 Languages" R.R. Tchaikovsky and E.L. Lysenkova assert that translation multiplicity as a multidimensional phenomenon existing in both synchronic and

diachronic, and passive and active kinds and types. The parameter of synchrony and diachrony reflects the chronological aspect of sequence of the existing foreign-language translations of the original text, although it is obvious that sometimes it is quite difficult to date the appearance of translation. Objective difficulties of dating the creation of a translated text may occur if the original text and translated texts appeared before the era of printing press, as well as in the situation when the date of publication of the translation is taken for the date of its creation. Often the difficulty of dating of translation is due to the lack of information about its translator. The parameter of activity and passivity underscores the importance of several translation variants in the original translated literature, their simultaneous active coexistence, or the activity of only one translation in functional limitations and passivity of the others. All the mentioned above allowed the Magadan scholars to formulate ten postulates of translation multiplicity (Tchaikovsky, Lysenkova 2001: 188-198).

Derivativeness is one of most important features of a translator's activity, which does not depend on the type of a text to be translated. The status of primary and secondary texts is defined by the relationship of unidirectional derivativeness established between them. However, it is extremely important to admit the fact that there is a unique relationship between the original literary text and its translation. If the text to be translated is non-literary, then the relationship of primary and secondary texts are invariably progressive, directed exclusively to the translation from the original text; however, in the situation of literary translation this relationship is more complex and ambiguous. The leadership of a primary literary text becomes less obvious and pronounced, since the existence of the original text is directly related to the emergence and success / failure of functioning of its derivatives – secondary variants

(foreign-language translations). Considering derivativeness as an ontological property of translation, N.M. Nesterova points at the possibility to determine the history of translation study as the history of relations between original texts and its translation (Nesterova 2005). In a famous paper by W. Benjamin "The Task of the Translator" (with the title "Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers" in the original), published in 1923 as a preface to his German translation of poems of Ch. Baudelaire, and greatly influenced the theory of translation, a scholar defended the original point of view on the nature of the relationship between the original text and its translation: the translation does not serve the reader, and it independently exists by itself; a translation provides growth for the original text, and continues its life. In the article, which became a program for action of many future generations of translation scholars, W. Benjamin writes: "In translation the original rises into a higher and purer linguistic air" (Benjamin 2007: 75). A literary theorist J. Derrida also emphasizes after W. Benjamin the relationship between the literary original and its translation, talks about the primacy of the copy (translation) over the original and claims that this is the original that needs to be translated, it wants to be translated, "„ the structure of the original is marked by a requirement to be translated. < ... > The original is the first debtor, the first petitioner, it begins by lacking and by pleading for translation" (Derrida 1985: 227). Translation is a process of growth and form of the original. "The life of the originals attains in them <translations – V.R.> to its ever-renewed latest and most abundant flowering" (Benjamin 2007: 72). The dependence of the original on its translation or translations is so strong that researchers have come to the conclusion of de-construction (according to J. Derrida) of the binary opposition between the original and its translation and the possibility of considering translation as transgression, involving a difference

and repetition of G. Deleuze's understanding (Andreeva 2011). It is of ultimate importance that the apologist of deconstruction sees "The Tower of Babel" not only as a recognized way and figure of an unrecoverable plurality of languages, but also a symbol of incompleteness, impossibility to complete the architectural design of the system and architectonics, one of the species and which will be the center of translation attraction: it will never be fully completed up to the end, and the number of translations will be permanently changed.

Most vivid, clear evidence of the nature of the relationship between the original and its translation is presented in centers of translation attraction. Undoubtedly, the most important and numerous center of translation attraction is generated by the Bible. According to the United Bible Society on December 31<sup>st</sup> 2007 the Bible is fully or partially translated into 2454 languages of the world.

In 1932, the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation being a body of the League of Nations founded the UNESCO translation database (Index Translationum), which is the world's only international bibliographic reference on translation. In 2012, the database was 80 years old, indicating that it accumulated huge volumes of information and is reliable. Index Translationum includes about 2,000,000 entries and over 250,000 authors, classified according to common rules of transliteration. It is the world's working reference base, which became the result of international cooperation between national libraries in all fields of knowledge. On November 1<sup>st</sup> 2013 the most translated author in the world was Agatha Christie (7232 records in the database). The top list, which includes 50 mostly translated authors, contains the following Russian writers: V.I. Lenin (7<sup>th</sup> position, 3592 records), F.M. Dostoevsky (16<sup>th</sup>, 2336), L.N. Tolstoy (23<sup>rd</sup>, 2161), A.P. Chekhov (42<sup>nd</sup>, 1456). According to

the database Russian language holds 4th place in the top 50 most translated languages in the world (103041), behind English (1,263,025), French (223575) and German (205970) languages.

**The Original Text and Translations  
of "Eugene Onegin"  
as a Center of Translation Attraction**

Works of Russian literature included in the above lists, regularly act as text-attractors, core fields of transferability of these texts. Now we shall consider the translation center of attraction, the core of which is the novel "Eugene Onegin" – an undisputed national treasure of Russian culture. The novel in verse is one of the most perfect and unique creatures of A.S. Pushkin and certainly one of the most difficult to convey in any foreign language (Alekseev 1964). Translation difficulties are caused by linguistic and cultural peculiarities of Pushkin's original, which were rightly pointed out in the extensive comments of Yu.M. Lotman (Lotman 1983) to the famous novel.

The poetry of Pushkin became known beyond the borders of Russia during the life of the author, and his creative legacy continues his life in numerous translations into various languages. The first mention of Pushkin's name in the foreign press refers to 1821. In 1823 in France and Germany were published the first translations of Pushkin's works. Russian poet, translator of German poetry and specialist in literature V. Neustadt describes interesting data that during the life of Pushkin in a relatively short period from 1823 to 1836 appeared about 75 translations of Pushkin's works in 12 foreign languages: German, French, Swedish, English, Polish, Italian, Serbian, Czech, Moldovan, Ukrainian, Georgian, Armenian (Neustadt 1937: 146). If we look at the history of Pushkin's translations heritage, one of the pressing issues is the question of what kind of Pushkin do foreign readers read in translation – French, German, Polish, or may be Russian?

Adhering the idea of cultural grids of A. Lefevere, we can assume that not all the translated literary texts can occupy some significant place in the grid of the translating culture.

A striking example is the historiography of "Eugene Onegin's" translations in French. According to various bibliographic sources, there are 17 French translations of the novel at present. The first translation made by A. Dupont was published in Paris and St. Petersburg in 1847. An undoubted feature of the French translations of "Eugene Onegin" ("Eugène Onéguine" in French) is the fact that the first translations of the novel into French were done by Russian translators. A prominent place among the first translators of the novel into French belongs to the translation by I.S. Turgenev and L. Viardot (1863), which was a major step in the assimilating the great Russian poet's work by the French culture (Izmailov 1974). In 1884 Vladimir Mikhailov's translation was published in Paris. The text of "Eugene Onegin" was translated into French by such masters of the literary work as Eugène de Porry (fragments), Gaston Pérot (1902), Maurice Colin (1980), Louis Aragon (via Elsa Triolet), Nata Minor (1990, received the Prix Nelly Sachs, given to the best translation into French of poetry), Jean-Louis Backès (1995) and Roger Legras (1994). The poetic translations by Gaston Pérot and Maurice Colin kept the original stanza, as well as more recent poetic translations of Jean-Louis Backès and Roger Legras were praised for their poetic translation (especially in Russian-French language pair) by E.G. Etkind. The following translations became famous: translations by Paul Béesau (1868), Albert de Villamarie (1904), Serge Baguette (1946), Michel Bayat (1956), André Meynieux (1962). One of the latest French version of "Eugene Onegin" was published in 2005 (the translator André Markovich) and is considered to be one of the best by critics. In 2010 a translation of Charles Weinstein was published.

In February 2013 in Paris at the linguistic forum "Expolangues" was the presentation of translation by Florian Vutev (a Bulgarian translator in his origin), published in December 2012.

The first translations of Pushkin's texts into English appeared in 1824, and in 1827-1828 years the English public attention was drawn to the published Russian text of "Eugene Onegin". During the life of A.S. Pushkin among English-speaking readers firmly established his reputation not only as the best Russian poet, but as a national poet. The first English translator of the novel was a Lieutenant Colonel H. Spalding (Henry Spalding "Eugene Onegin", London: Macmillan & Co., 1881). I.S. Turgenev (a translator of "Eugene Onegin" in French, and the author of a famous phrase about Pushkin's translators "There are brave people in the world!") wrote about this translation: "... I was allowed to read a translation of "Onegin" made by the English rhymes by some colonel, and the translation was both: – of incredible and wonderful fidelity, – and of amazing gracelessness" (Turgenev 1938: 158). A.S. Pushkin was perceived by English readers of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century as a modern popular poet. In Pushkin's translations readers were looking for a "real" and "exotic" life of far-away-from-London-and-New-York Russia. Although even at that time it was already known that A.S. Pushkin was a Russian national poet who deserved a place in the pantheon of world poets. English readers and writers perceived Pushkin only in comparison with Shakespeare or W. Scott and therefore called him "Russian Byron" (Leighton 1999: 136). Only in the 20<sup>th</sup> century the West developed a deeper understanding of A.S. Pushkin's creative heritage.

The translation history of the novel "Eugene Onegin" in English has more than 130 years: the first translation was published in 1881 (translator H. Spalding), the last known to us translation appeared in 2011 (translator

M. Hobson). At the present time there are more than forty English "Onegin". One of the latest translations of the novel was made by a professor Stanley Mitchell (1932-2011) at the University of London. The translation was published in 2008 by the publishing house Penguin Classics and was praised by translators, linguists, literary critics and readers. In 2013 the English version of Pushkin's text that was narrated for an audio book by Stephen Fry – a famous British actor and writer. Stephen Fry used for the narration the text of translation by American scholar and translator James E. Falen (1990). Currently we know about the existence of more than 40 translations of the novel into English. The translations have different popularity, the literary form (poetic or prosaic), completeness of the original text. So, among the most famous translations are traditionally already mentioned above translation by Spalding in 1881 (the first full-text English translation), translation by V.V. Nabokov in 1964 and 1975 (with extensive commentaries by the translator), translating of W. Arndt in 1963 and its author's edition of 1992 (was awarded Bollingen prize, above all, for keeping the unique "Onegin" stanza).

The translations of K. Cahill and R. Clarke are a prosaic English version of Pushkin's poetic original. In the translation corpus one can find translations published in very small circulations (K. Cahill), existing only in typewritten versions (B. Simmons, M. Stone) or only Internet resources (E. Bonver, A. Corré, A. Kline, D. Litoshick). There are translations of individual chapters or fragments of Pushkin's text (K. Cahill, D. Litoshick, E. Turner). Extremely important is the fact that some translators have repeatedly appealed to Pushkin's text: W. Arndt (1963 and 1992), V.V. Nabokov (1962 and 1975), B. Deutsch (1936, 1943 and 1964), Ch. Johnston (1977, 2003), S.N. Kozlov (1994, 1998), W. Liberson (1975, 1987). With repeated appeals to the poetic original the translators offered not only



a new edition of their own translations, but practically a new foreign language version. Two translations made on the basis of translation predecessors K. Cahill (based on the translation of Nabokov), A. Briggs (based on the translation of O. Elton). There are translations into English done by Russian translators and published only in Russia (S.A. Makourenkova, and S.N. Kozlov) (Lee). The aim of this work is not to conduct a comparative analysis of English "Eugene Onegin" and its critical evaluation of the various using various translation criteria. Among the English translations there are undoubtedly translations of varying quality. Some of these translations were described by K.I. Chukovsky: "What to say about the English translations of "Eugene Onegin"? You read them and painfully go from page to page watching this brilliantly laconic, unmatched marvelous musical speech of one of the greatest masters of the Russian language, to be turned into a set of smooth, empty and trivial phrases by translators" (Chukovsky 1988: 246). However, we need to admit that the emergence of numerous translations from one original draws readers' attention to the literary text, singling it out of wide space of foreign cultural texts.

If in some European countries the first translations of "Eugene Onegin" began to appear in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, readers around the world had an opportunity to meet the outstanding work of Russian literature in relatively recent time. So, "Eugene Onegin" in the Mongolian language was first published in 1956 (translated by Ch. Chimid). Chinese translations of the novel appeared in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the history of their appearance was directly dependent on the political situation in China and educated Chinese interest in the Russian language. The first translation was done by Su Fu, and was published in 1942.

Two years later (1944) there was a translation of Lu Ying. The translation of Ma Dan was published in 1954, but thirty years later (1983)

the translator offers almost a new version of the novel's translation. Translations of "Eugene Onegin" were performed by Wang Shisie (1981), Wang Zhiliang (1985 and 2004), Feng Chun (1982 and 1991), Ding Lu (1996), Liu Zunzi (2002). The last known Chinese translations were published in 2003: Gu Yunpu and Tian Guobin. Currently, there are a number of translations of "Eugene Onegin" in Japanese. The first two Japanese "Onegins" simultaneously appeared in 1921 in Tokyo (translators Okagami Morimichi and Yonekawa Masao). The best known novel's Japanese translations are the following: Kentaro Ikeda (1962); Kaneko Yoshihiko (1972, reprint 1994); Shoichi Kimura (1972, 1998 and 2002 reissue); Katsu Kimura (1975, reprint 1991); Masao Ozawa (1996). Most Japanese translations are in a prosaic form and convey the form of work without concern for poetic rhythm, which corresponds to the translation of the Japanese tradition dating back to the annotated translation of Chinese texts *kanbun kundoku*. Only two Japanese translations (Katsu Kimura, Masao Ozawa) are presented in a poetic form. The first poetic translation into Spanish of "Eugene Onegin" appeared in 2009 (translated by M. Chilikov) and demanded eight years of painstaking work (almost as much time as creating the original.)

A significant factor affecting the appearance of foreign-language translation of "Eugene Onegin" are celebrations of Pushkin's anniversaries. Since 1937 (the year of the centenary of the poet's death) was an important step in the development of a foreign language Pushkin. In England, the USA, Australia, India, Singapore and Shanghai 112 academic publications devoted to the study of creativity of Pushkin were published. In the jubilee year 26 verse and prosaic translations of works of Alexander Pushkin appeared (including three English translations of "Eugene Onegin" by O. Elton, B. Deutsch and D. Prall-Radin together with D.Z. Patrick ) (Leighton 1999:

135-139) . In Jerusalem, two "Eugene Onegin" were published in Hebrew (the translators were A. Levinson and A. Shlonsky). "Eugene Onegin" translated by A. Shlonsky and his comments later were reprinted several times. Scholars, studying Pushkin's works, unanimously consider translations by A. Shlonsky to be classic because he managed to accurately preserve the Pushkin's rhyme in Hebrew.

The historiography of German translations of the novel is quite extensive. The first German translation ("Jewgenij Onegin") was made by K.R. Lippert in 1840, turned out, according to experts, to be unsuccessful. The translator did not follow Onegin's stanza, broke the lyrical composition of the novel, made semantic errors and "germanized" Pushkin's text, turning Tatiana into Johanna. But even the highly inaccurate translation made a huge impression on the Western European critics and readers (Neustadt 1937: 149). More successful was the translation of F. Bodenshtedt in 1854. Later, there were translations of M. Zeibert (1874), L. Blumenthal (1878), A. Lupus (1899), T. Commichau (1916). The best German translation is now considered the translation by R.-D. Keil published in 1980 and in 1983 was awarded by a prize of German Academy of Language and Poetry. This translation is the twelfth full translation of Pushkin's text into German. Polish translation of "Eugene Onegin",

published in Warsaw in the early 50s (translation by – J. Tuwim and A. Ważyk) was praised by critics and readers.

### Conclusion

Thus, the center of translation attraction in which "Eugene Onegin" by A.S. Pushkin, the "strong" text of Russian literature and culture, acts as its core part, clearly and convincingly illustrates the phenomenon of literocentrism of Russian culture. Numerous foreign-language translations of Pushkin's text created in 19-20-21<sup>st</sup> centuries provide the "continuity" of the culturally significant poetic original in time and cultural spaces, and it serves as a guarantee of its "persistence" and survival. Translation of a "strong" text becomes a certain challenge, a certain test of "our" culture by "other" cultures. The given analysis of the translations of "Eugene Onegin" was mostly limited to interlingual type of literary translation (in the interpretation of R. Jakobson). The examples of multilinguality, polytextuality, polyvariety of the culturally significant original can be significantly expanded in the light of intersemiotic translation (opera, ballet and theater performances, film adaptation and duplication, sculpture, graphics), which may be the subject of a separate investigation and provide evidence of "power" of the "strong" literary text.

### References

1. Alekseev, M.P. (1964). "Eugene Onegin" in Languages of the World ["Yevgeniy Onegin" na yazykakh mira] // *The Mastery of Translation [Masterstro perevoda]*. Moscow: Sovetskiy pisatel'. Pp. 273-286.
2. Andreeva, E.V. (2011). Translation as Transgression [Perevod kak transgressiya // *Bulletin of Kharkov National University [Visnik KhNU imeni V.N. Karazina. № 952. Seriya: filozofiya. Filosofskii peripetiii]*. Pp. 63-68.
3. Arkhangelsky, A. (2012). Between the Guarantee and the Chance (Foreword) // Matrix of Russian Culture: Myth? Engine of Modernization? Barrier? [Mezhdru garantiyey i shansom (Predisloviye)] // *Matritsa russkoy kul'tury: Mif? Dvigatel' modernizatsii? Bar'yer?*. Moscow: "Leo Tolstoy". Pp. 6-12.

4. Assmann, J. (1992). *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis. Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*. München: C. H. Beck.
5. Bassenett, S.; Lefevere, A. (1998) *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Topics in Translation. 11. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
6. Benjamin, W. (2007). The Task of the Translator. An Introduction to the Translation of Baudelaire's *Tableaux Parisiens // Illuminations, translated by Harry Zohn*. New York: Schocken Books. Pp. 69-82.
7. Chukovsky, K.I. (1988). Onegin in Exile // *Friendship of Peoples* [Onegin na chuzhbine // *Druzhba narodov*]. №4. Pp. 246-256.
8. Derrida, J. (1985). From Des Tours de Babel // *Difference in Translation, edited and translated by Joseph F. Graham*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press. Pp. 218-227.
9. Index Translationum // <http://www.unesco.org/xtrans/bsstatexp.aspx> (accessed 17 November 2013)
10. Izmailov, N.V. (1974). Turgenev is a Translator of Pushkin into French // *Pushkin. Research and Materials* [Turgenev – perevodchik Pushkina na frantsuzskiy yazyk // *Pushkin. Issledovaniya i materialy*]. T. 7. Pushkin and world literature. Leningrad: Nauka. Pp. 185-203.
11. Karasik, V.I. (2013). *Language Matrix of Culture* [Yazykovaya matritsa kul'tury]. Moscow: Gnosis.
12. Kondakov, I.V. (1992). An Attempt against Literature (About the Fight of Literary Criticism with the Literature in Russian Culture) // *Problems of Literature* [Pokusheniye na literaturu (O bor'be literaturnoy kritiki s literaturoy v russkoy kul'ture) // *Voprosy literatury*]. № 2. Pp. 75-127.
13. Kondakov, I.V. (1994). *Introduction into the History of Russian Culture. Theoretical Essay* [Vvedeniye v istoriyu russkoy kul'tury. Teoreticheskiy ocherk]. Moscow: Nauka.
14. Kondakov, I.V. (2008). Beyond the Words: the Crisis of Literocentrism in Russia of 20-21<sup>st</sup> centuries. // *Problems of Literature* [Po tu storonu slova: krizis literaturotsentrizma v Rossii XX-XXI vv. // *Vopros literatury*]. № 5. Pp.5-44.
15. Kuzmina, N.A. (2009). *The Intertext: Theme and Variations. Phenomena of Culture and Language in Intertextual Interpretation* [Intertekst: tema s variatsiyami. Fenomeny kul'tury i yazyka v intertekstual'noy interpretatsii.]. Omsk: Omsk State University Press.
16. Lee, P. A.S. Pushkin, English Versions of Eugene Onegin // <http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~pml1/onegin/welcome.htm> (accessed 17 November 2013)
17. Leighton, L.G. (1999). Pushkin in the English-Speaking World // *Bulletin of the Russian Academy of Sciences* [Pushkin v angloyazychnom mire // *Vestnik Rossiyskoy akademii nauk*]. Vol. 68. № 2. Pp. 135-139.
18. Levin, Yu.D. (1992). The Problem of Translation Multiplicity // *Literature and Translation: Theory* [Problema perevodnoy mnozhestvennosti // *Literatura i perevod: problemy teorii*]. Moscow: Publishing group "Progress"; "Litera". Pp. 213-224.
19. Lipovetsky, M. Conceptualism and Neo-Baroque. Bipolar Model of Russian Postmodernism [Kontseptualizm i neobarokko. Bipolyarnaya model' russkogo postmodernizma] // [exlibris.ng.ru/kafedra/2000-09-07/3\\_postmodern.html](http://exlibris.ng.ru/kafedra/2000-09-07/3_postmodern.html) (accessed 17 November 2013).
20. Lotman, Yu.M. (1983). *A.S. Pushkin's Novel "Eugene Onegin". Comments* [Roman A.S. Pushkina "Yevgeniy Onegin". Kommentariy]. Lenigrad: Prosveschenie.

21. Lotman, Yu.M. (1998). The Structure of Literary Text // *About Art* [Strukturakhudozhestvennogo teksta // *Ob iskusstve*]. St. Petersburg: Iskusstvo. Pp. 14-285.

22. Lubavin, M.N. (2002). Archetypal Matrix of Russian Culture [*Arkhitepicheskaya matritsa russkoy kul'tury*]: Dissertation of a Candidate in Philosophy. Nizhny Novgorod.

23. Monastyrsky, A. (1999). *Glossary Terms of Moscow Conceptual School* [*Slovar' terminov moskovskoy kontseptual'noy shkoly*]. Moscow: Ad Marginem.

24. Nesterova, N.M. (2005). Derivativeness as an Ontological Characteristic of Translation [*Vtorichnost' kak ontologicheskoye svoystvo perevoda*]: Dissertation of a Doctor in Philology. Perm.

25. Neustadt, V. (1937). Pushkin in World Literature [Pushkin v mirovoy literature] // *Krasnaya nov'*. № 1. Pp. 144-173.

26. Polubichenko, L.V. (2010). The Image of Russia in Oxford Dictionary of Quotations // *Bulletin of Moscow State University. Ser. 19. Linguistics and Intercultural Communication* [Obraz Rossii v Oksfordskom slovare tsitat // *Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*]. №1. Pp. 46-64.

27. Tchaikovsky, R.R.; Lysenkova, E.L. (2001). *The Inexhaustible Original: 100 Translations of "Panther" by R.M. Rilke into 15 Languages* [*Neischerpayemost' originala. 100 perevodov "Pantery" R.M. Ril'ke na 15 yazykov*]. Magadan: Kordis.

28. The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations (2009). / Ed. by Elizabeth Knowles. 7<sup>th</sup> edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

29. Turgenev, I.S. (1938). A Few Words about Pushkin // *Russian Writers of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century on Pushkin* [Neskol'ko slov o Pushkine // *Russkiye pisateli XIX veka o Pushkine*]. Leningrad: Khudizhestvennaya literatura.

30. Urzhumova, A.V. How Russia is Represented in Oxford Dictionary of Quotations [*Kak predstavlena Rossiya v Oksfordskikh slovaryakh tsitat*] // [http:// www.sworld.com.ua/index.php/ru/philosophy-and-philology-311/ linguistics-and-foreign-languages-in-the-world-today-311/7643-as-presented-to-russia-in-oxford](http://www.sworld.com.ua/index.php/ru/philosophy-and-philology-311/linguistics-and-foreign-languages-in-the-world-today-311/7643-as-presented-to-russia-in-oxford) (accessed 17 November 2013)

31. Zapesotsky, Yu. (2013). Image as a "Text" and Value-Normative Culture Matrix // *Human* [Obraz kak "tekst" i tsennostno-normativnaya matritsa kul'tury // *Chelovek*]. № 2. Pp. 93-97.

## **“Сильные” тексты русской культуры и центры переводческой аттракции**

**В.А. Разумовская**

Сибирский федеральный университет  
Россия, 660041, Красноярск, пр. Свободный, 79

---

*Статья посвящена вопросам возникновения центров переводческой аттракции в результате генерирования вторичных переводческих текстов “сильными” художественными оригиналами. Материалом настоящего исследования послужили русский оригинальный текст “Евгения Онегина” и его иноязычные переводы, созданные и опубликованные в XIX–XXI веках. “Сильный” текст рассматривается с позиций значимого для русской культуры понятия литературоцентризма, а также с привлечением сравнительно новой категории переводной множественности. Сочетание литературоведческого и переводоведческого аспектов обеспечивает комплементарный подход к исследуемой проблеме.*

*Ключевые слова: художественный перевод, центр переводческой аттракции, литературоцентризм, русская литература, переводная множественность, “Евгений Онегин”.*

---