Strategies of Translating Sexualities as Part of the Secularization of Eighteenth- and Early Nineteenth-Century Russia

Sergey Tyulenev

Abstract

:This article considers one of the understudied areas of Russian translation history—the role translation played in introducing works of verbal art with a distinct sexual component as part of the program of wWesternization of eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Russia. The purpose is to look at the broad spectrum of translation strategies that were used in order to introduce sexuality as a literary theme into a new secularized Russia spanning from bowdlerized to faithful renderings, and thereby liberalize social mores and challenge dominant systemic discourse. With the help of Luhmann's social systems theory, translation is shown to be both as a means of enriching the nascent Russian literary subsystem with established masterpieces of Greco-Roman aAntiquity and wWestern European vernacular literatures and, at the same time, not infrequently forcing unpalatable manifestations of sexuality into the target system's set of values. The authors analyzes the vicissitudes of translations of Sappho's Second Ode and Pushkin's use of translation techniques in order to challenge the official religious and state establishment in some of his controversial poetic works, notably *An Imitation of the Arabic, Monk*, and *Gavriiliada*.

Keywords: Russia; translation; sexuality; Luhmann; Sappho; Pushkin

Although much research has been conducted to reveal hitherto hushed up facets of Russian sexual social and arts history, so far, the investigation of homosexuality and sexuality in general in Russia has been carried out mostly within the framework of social history and mainly with the

Comment [NT1]: FYI, in this piece you'll notice that I've deleted most ellipsis dots. Unless the ellipses are in the original, you don't need them at the beginning and the end of each quotation, indicating that there's material before and after it that you're cutting out. Please review throughout.

Comment [st2R1]: OK

emphasis on modern history. Eroticism and same-sex desire in literature have been touched ~~up~~on mostly in relation to the twentieth century with only rare exceptions.[1] Hence, as Dan Healey wrote, "if Russian history is famously littered with 'blank spots', then the story of the understanding and treatment of homosexuality [and sexuality in general—*S.T.*] in this society must surely be one of the most obscure."[2] If the general (social) history of sexuality in Russia is such a "~~'~~blank spot~~'~~," what can be said about such an unstudied cultural phenomenon as the role of translation in the Russian history of sexuality!

Sexuality is one of the characteristic human needs and mechanisms of social interaction. The same also holds true in the case of forms of sexuality less conventional within Abrahamic religions, such as same-sex desire. Thus, taking into account the universality of sexuality including "same-sex sexual contact [which] probably occurs everywhere,"[3] but, I would add, is invested with different meanings in different historical and cultural contexts, one can expect to come across these practices and identities in all types of societies, including Russia. However, o~~O~~ne may get~~, however,~~ a wrong impression about this while thumbing through histories of sexuality of the world, for Russia is hardly mentioned in many of them.

My focus in the present article is to consider the role of translation in the eighteenth and ~~–~~ early nineteenth centuries of the Russian history. Translation is (and was in that period) a powerful social mechanism, which is responsible for the interaction of the social system and its social environment. I use the terms "social system" and "environment" in the sense of Niklas Luhmann's social systems theory.[4] Luhmann considered any social formation, from a nation-state to a conversation, as a system, which is characterized by its internal communication (types of interactions distinguishing it from everything else) and structure with its boundary. The social system is functionally closed: its environment, that is, external social phenomena and other systems, may prompt the social system's changes but cannot impose them. Yet social systems are open for interactions with their environment because they cannot exist otherwise—they draw information from the environment (although they process the received information according to

their internal laws, that is, according to their communication).

Translation is one of the internal functions of social systems, which Luhmann termed "boundary phenomena." The role of boundary phenomena is to facilitate social systems' interaction with their environments. Translation helps a given system receive information from its environment. Without translation, information is unintelligible: systems and their environments speak different languages. Translation, in this regard, is the social mechanism which turns the unintelligible into the intelligible. Translation also introduces new options into the communicative repertoire of the system. I have discussed how translation does this in detail elsewhere;[5] ~~;~~ in this paper, I will further develop just one aspect—the role of translation in the introduction of new concepts into a social system. More specifically, I will consider this role of translation as regards works of verbal art with a distinct sexual component. The purpose is to look at the broad spectrum of translation strategies that were used in order to introduce sexuality as a literary theme into a newly secularized Russia.

Russian Enlightenment and Greco-Roman Antiquity

The translation repertoire in eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Russia attempted to be truly universal, embracing works from a~~A~~ntiquity as well as contemporaneous European and Oriental cultures. In this paper, I opt for a more inclusive definition of translation than simply interlingual transfer of a text from one linguocultural system into another because this narrow understanding of translation does not correspond to the theory and practice of translation in the period in question.[6] If one were to study only translation as interlingual transfer, one would automatically exclude a large number of texts produced in Russia in the process of its westernization in the eighteenth century. This, ultimately, would lead to distorting the entire studied phenomenon. Another argument against limiting the term *translation* to only interlingual transfer is that it would be extremely difficult—if at all possible—to draw a clear borderline

between translations proper and other forms of textual transfer. Hence, the term *translation* in this ~~essay~~ paper embraces all kinds of interlingual transfer of texts, not only texts explicitly called "translations," but also adaptations and imitations, so popular at the time in Russia, in keeping with neo-classicist aesthetic principles. These transfers may or may not be named translations by their producers or consumers; they may also follow one original or be a translation of compilatory nature. They may even be pseudo-translations, which often appeared in almanacs for fear of censorship.[7]

In eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Russia, a special emphasis was ~~laid~~ put on the necessity to absorb the heritage of Greco-Roman a~~A~~ntiquity as a part of the program of ~~the~~ westernization of the empire. The major thrust of the social, political, and cultural reformation was to replace old lifestyle and social practices with new ones, emulating the (w~~W~~estern) European way. At the beginning of the reforms (the first quarter of the eighteenth century), the main task was to boost the economy. But very soon it was realized that a full-fledged westernization required much more—major cultural changes needed to be introduced. To reach the cultural level of w~~W~~estern Europe, Russia needed to appreciate common European cultural roots going as far back as the Greco-Roman civilization. Hence, the next main point on the agenda of the reforms was to absorb the c~~C~~lassical heritage.

Another aspect of eighteenth-century Russia's reforms was the secularization of society in repealing aesthetic prohibitions against laughter and love.[8] Love as a literary theme comes close to depicting sexuality and sexual practices. Under the influence of hypocritical "gra~~e~~y" guardians of social morals, sexuality and sex in the Abrahamic religions were made synonymous with obscenity and pornography. Addressing the same issue, although later, D. H. Lawrence wrote in his essay "Pornography and Obscenity" that "~~[~~p~~]~~ornography is the attempt to insult sex, to do dirt on it."[9] In the eighteenth century, sexuality was still considered one of those "dirty" subjects, which were ~~'~~*personae non gratae*~~'~~ in the socially acceptable literary corpus. Hence, not infrequently, the way of viewing sexuality and its expression in the source cultures made

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

translators, editors, and publishers resort to a wide range of techniques—if not tricks—in order to translate a work of literary art of recognized merit~~,~~ ~~yet~~ that containe~~d~~~~ing~~ too many explicit references to frowned-~~up~~on sexual tastes and practices. Some of the boldest moves in the change of public attitude to sexuality were attempted in literary translation.

Translation's role in the introduction of new literary themes and forms worldwide, and in Russia in particular, is well-~~-~~known.[10] Here, I would like to recast the discussion of the role of translation into social-systemic terms in order to explore its social function from a broader social perspective.

All social systems evolve over time and an important question is: How does newness enter the dominant socio-cultural discourse? Translation as a boundary phenomenon is one of the major agents of social-systemic evolution. Luhmann considers social evolution as ~~consisting of~~comprising three stages: variation, selection, and stabilization.[11] Luhmann did not discuss the role of translation in these stages, the viewpoint that will inform my discussion. At the first stage, variation, translation introduces new information from the environment. The new that translation brings into the system may question the existing social systemic communication (dominant or established discursive practices). Some of the suggested alternatives may be accepted, some may be rejected or put aside for later (re-)consideration. Importantly, translation offers something new or even radically new, as was the case during the westernization of eighteenth- and ~~-~~early nineteenth-~~-~~century Russia. In that period, translation does not necessarily initiate changes or even look for something new in the environment on its own initiative. It was largely the political will to westernize Russia that activated translational processes. Yet translation was a *sine qua non* ~~*conditio*~~ of westernization, and without it the political agenda would not have been realizable.

As translation introduces the new at the stage of variation, the system immediately starts processing the suggested options according to the systemic internal communication. This is the stage of selection. At this ~~stage~~point, it is up to the system (represented by politics, art~~s~~,

grammar~~s~~, lexicography, art criticism, aesthetics, etc.) to decide what is to be accepted and what is to be rejected. As the options suggested by translation are considered (some accepted, some rejected), the stage of stabilization of the systemic communication sets in. At the stage of stabilization, the system operates in a renewed way, that is, with new communicative patterns adopted and adapted to the system's needs.

It will be noted that at the first stage, ~~—~~variation, translation acts primarily as a revolutionizing agent, whereas at the stage of stabilization, translation obeys the system-made choices and follows new rules, some of which were suggested by translation itself and ratified by the system. Luhmann, however, does not theorize the stages as a temporally organized consecutive sequence. The three stages occur circularly rather than as a sort of linear causality: while one translation operates to bring in variation, another may conform to the dominant discourse. Also, translations combine both novelty and tradition; at that, some translations may manifest more of the revolutionary intentionality whereas others act more in compliance with the established intrasystemic norms. Both types partially introduce the new, that is, act as the stage of variation requires, and both partially conform to the old in accordance with the stage of stabilization; it is the ratio of the former to the latter that makes them different. Let us consider the role of translation in the evolution of Russia qua social system in the aspect of sexuality as a literary theme.[12]

Luhmann's vision of the social-systemic evolutionary cycle and the theorization of the role of translation in it as suggested in this ~~essay~~ paper is helpful in order to add the social-systemic dimension to the opposition "~~"~~domestication~~—~~foreignization~~"~~."[13] Luhmann's social theory helps to tie translation up with social processes and contextualizes domesticating/foreignizing translation techniques and strategies. Put differently, it becomes possible to explain not only *what* translation does but also *why* and *with what social-systemic consequences*.

Translation Introduces Homoeroticism

Translating a Lesbian Poem

Sappho's poetry was part of the literary canon of Greco-Roman aAntiquity and was actively translated within the program of the westernization of Russia. Sappho's Second Ode proved to be the most popular, and not fewer than fifty translations of it appeared starting from the mid-eighteenth century onwards. Recently, a special study in Russia explored the history of Sappho's poetry and cultural image.[14] Here, I am pursuing a different goal—I will consider different approaches to translating Sappho's Second Ode with its unconventional sexual content in eighteenth-century Russia.

Sappho could be read as an example of a "morally inconvenient" literary figure of the Greco-Roman aAntiquity. The history of translations of the Second Ode (fFragment 31) in Russia followed two lines: bowdlerizing or keeping the nature of the described drama intact. (An English translation of Second Ode can be found in aAppendix 1, below.) None of the Russian translators whose versions are discussed here translated directly from aAncient Greek. Mostly, early Russian translators worked from the French version by Boileau in his translation of Pseudo-Longinus's treatise *On the Sublime* (1674).

Joseph Addison, a famous British essayist of the early eighteenth century, complained that Boileau's translation gave "us all the poetry, but not all the passion of the famous fragment" (*Spectator*, nNo. 221, Nov.ember 22, 1711); yet what is important for the discussion at hand is that, Boileau transferred faithfully the love triangle. (Boileau's translation can be found in aAppendix 2, below.)[15]) Already in the first line, the reader sees a couple—a male and a female—at whom Sappho—narrator is looking: "Heureux! qui prés de toi, pour toi seule soûpire [. . .]" ([Happy is he who is beside you, is sighing for you alone. . .)]. The adjective "heureux" is of the masculine grammatical gender, whereas the adjective "seule" defining the pronoun

"toi," the addressee of the narrator, is of the feminine grammatical gender. The narrator is also clearly a woman: in the closing stanza, she is said to feel "interdite, éperduë" ([rejected, overwhelmed),] where both modifiers are of the feminine grammatical gender. Moreover, the narrator is unequivocally identified as Sappho herself; this is clear from the translation of Pseudo-Longinus's commentary by Boileau: "[. . . .] quand Sapho veut exprimer les fureurs de l'Amour, elle ramasse de tous côtez les accidens qui suivent & qui accompagnent en effet cette passion [. . . .]" [. . . .(when Sappho wants to express the perturbations of Love, she brings together various manifestations which follow and accompany this passion) . . . .]. In Sappho's original, the feminine grammatical gender is used when referring to the narrator, thereby making clear its sex (in the phrase *tromos de pasan agrei* [trembling seizes all of me] in the thirteenth and fourteenth lines, where the word *pasan* [all, entire] is of the feminine gender); the male is clearly depicted in the opening stanza. The male's lover is a female, as implied at the end of the first and the beginning of the second stanzas in Sappho's description of her as having "sweet voice" and "charming laugh." In his version, even without stating the sex of the narrator, Boileau implies that the narrator is a female. Boileau did not bowdlerize Sappho's fragment in his translation of Longinus; he, following Longinus, identified Sappho as the narrator, as is clear from his translation of the commentaries accompanying the poem. Thus, the triangle in Boileau's translation is as follows: the female narrator sees a male talking with a female who is the object of the narrator's passion.

Some Russian translators kept the genders of the protagonists (e.g., Derzhavin, about whose versions see below), but some either replaced the triangle "Sappho—a girl, the object of her passion—a man sitting with the girl" with the triangle "a male narrator—a girl—a man sitting with the girl" or even turned the trio into a heterosexual duo (see an example below). I would argue that changes were made in order to accommodate the dominant social norms, as the original configuration of the love triangle was unacceptable for the general public. The simplest way was to replace the female narrator with a male narrator or to eliminate gendered tale-telling

adjectives describing the narrator. Such bowdlerized versions were acceptable even if readers knew that the version they read was somehow related to a poem originally written by Sappho.

Let us consider one of the most radically transforming translations—by Aleksandr Sumarokov, *Ода Ссапфическая (Sapphic Ode)* (1785). (The full text is reproduced in aAppendix 3, below.)[16] If, according to Addison, Boileau was to blame for rendering only poetry but not Sappho's passion, then Sumarokov definitely was to blame for doing something even more radical. Sumarokov focused on the poetic properties of the original: he reproduced the Sapphic stanza, thereby making an equimetrical, although not equilinear, translation; and he did depict the passion of a lover, yet he changed the drama of the original. In his version, there is a female, the object of passion, whose sex is made clear by the words of the feminine grammatical gender (*единая*, *драгая*, *причастна*, *страстна* [only, dear, sharing, passionate]). Yet there is no trace of a triangle, let alone the female—female—male triangle seen from the point of view of the lesbian narrator. True, there is no gender indications as far as the narrator is concerned; but taking into account the conventional nature of Sumarokov's text, the odds are that it was read rather as an experiment with the Sapphic stanza, rather than an attempt to reproduce the unconventional sexual behavior described in the original. Yet, since out of the three most prominent features of Sappho's Second Ode—lesbianism, love passion, meter—Sumarokov attempted to reproduce two—love passion and meter, i. It is difficult to think of his text as too distant from, and therefore independent of, Sappho's Ode. All the more so, the first translation of Sappho's Ode into Russian (in prose) by Grigorii Kozitskii, keeping the lesbo-erotic nature of the poem, was published in Sumarokov's literary journal *Трудолюбивая Пчела (The Industrious Bee)* in 1759; therefore, Sumarokov must have known the nature of sexuality reflected in the original yet he chose to alter it.

Another way to "rectify" Sappho's poem is seen in a version by Vasilii Zhukovskii, not only a prominent poet of the early nineteenth century, but also one of the most prolific and influential translators. (The full text of his version *Сафина Ода* [Sappho's Ode] can be found in

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [NT3]: Italicization of Russian here OK, to match the way other foreign languages are handled? For instance, if this were French, not in quotation marks or in a block quotation, it would almost certainly be italicized. Please review throughout.

Comment [st4]: OK

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

a~~A~~ppendix 4, below.)[17] ~~,)~~ Zhukovskii does not change the sex of the narrator (see the feminine grammatical gender in the closing stanza: *утомлена*, *лишена* [exhausted, devoid]); instead, he makes her pine for a male. This is obvious from the opening line, ~~:~~ "~~. . .~~ одним тобой пылает~~. . .~~" (~~[. . .~~is burning for you alone~~)]~~, where the word *одним* is of the masculine grammatical gender in Russian. In fact, there is no love triangle at all. As was the case with Sumarokov's version, Zhukovskii's tells a story of unrequited love. The female narrator speaks of her love for a man and envies anybody who is close to him, speaking with him and seeing him smile. The masculine gender, used to describe the one who is beside the object of the narrator's passion, the one who is described as *блажен*, *обворожен*, *сравнен* (~~[~~blessed, bewitched, comparable~~)]~~, is the case of the generalizing use of the masculine—referring to both genders (the so-called common gender). The meaning, thus, is as follows: whoever is beside you burning for you, bewitched by your words, ~~etc.~~and so forth, is blessed. By implication, this "blessed" person must be a female, like the narrator herself. Zhukovskii "rectifies" the sexual orientation of the narrator: in his translation, she is heterosexual woman in love with a man. The "blessed" person whom the narrator envies must also be a woman. It is hard to imagine that Zhukovskii, "rectifying" the sexual orientation of the narrator, would make the man, with whom she is in love, love another man. Such an assumption would make the man whom the narrator loves a homosexual, but why would Zhukovskii, while "normalizing" the lesbian passion, would allow male homosexuality? Therefore, the conclusion must be that Zhukovskii's version of Sappho's Ode makes the narrator a heterosexual woman who is in love with a man and who envies any other woman she sees with him.

Such translations as Sumarokov's and Zhukovskii's are examples of the translation as a social boundary phenomenon which, on the one hand, does introduce a new element into the intrasystemic communication, the Sapphic stanza and a higher degree of love passion than was usual to describe in the nascent high secular Russian literature, and thereby acts in accordance with the requirements of the variation stage of the systemic evolutionary cycle. But it is also a

Formatted: Font: Italic
Formatted: Font: Italic
Formatted: Font: Italic
Formatted: Font: Italic
Formatted: Font: Italic
Formatted: Font: Italic

type of translation which, on the other hand, conforms to convention and thereby acts in compliance with the principles of the stabilization stage. Sappho and sapphism in such Russian versions were made more palatable to the dominant Russian mores. Sappho had been well-known in Russia from the mid-eighteenth century onward, so much so that the notion of sapphism became a Russian euphemism of the idiosyncratic sexual taste~~, like that of the poetess from Lesbos~~. In an issue of the magazine *Лекарство от скуки* (~~(~~*A Medicine for Boredom*)~~}~~ (1787, n~~N~~o. 37, Mar.~~ch~~ 10), Sappho was presented as the most passionate woman of her time. The reader was told that she used any available means to satisfy her passion~~ and there was no such means that she did not use~~. Even a crowd of lovers was not able to satiate her.[18] Such facts and the existence of the other line of rendering Sappho's Second Ode (see below) do make one suspect the intentional bowdlerization in the translations of the type illustrated by Sumarokov's and Zhukovskii's versions.

Comment [st5]: Deletion OK

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [st6]: Deletion OK

Curiously, in this type of translation~~s~~ of Sappho's Second Ode into Russian one observes a phenomenon opposite to what I described elsewhere as translation as smuggling.[19] There, among other things, I considered how another eighteenth-century Russian writer and translator, Ivan Dmitriev, rendered La Fontaine's fables by adding to the text his own homosexual views and sentiments. He acted in the opposite way as compared to the translators who bowdlerized the lesbian features of Sappho's ode: he presented texts which were conventional in their heterosexuality as having homosexual features. Dmitriev translated texts, which could not promise to introduce anything more than conventional views and whose more direct translation would comply with the conforming stage of the social-systemic evolutionary cycle, so as to introduce something more radical, something associated with the revolutionizing nature of the translation of the first stage of the social evolution.

Let us consider the second approach of Russian translators to rendering Sappho's Second Ode. This second approach was to keep lesbian passion. The first one was a prosaic version by Grigorii Kozitskii *На девицу* (~~(~~*On a Girl*)~~}~~, briefly mentioned above in connection with

Formatted: Font: Italic

Sumarokov. The second one was the first poetic translation. ~~It was~~ accomplished by I. Vinogradov and ~~was~~ first published in 1786 and in a new version in 1792. The translation was directly ~~en~~titled *К девице* (~~*}*~~*To a Girl*)~~]~~. Sviiasov writes that "the rendering of the second ode by Vinogradov was important because the reader ~~[~~. . . ~~]~~could appreciate the poem not through a morally neutralized translation by Boileau, but directly through a translation of the Greek original, keeping the love triangle~~[. . .]~~."[20] Vinogradov's version was definitely important, yet, as I have shown above, the attentive reading of Boileau's translation makes it obvious that it is a mistake to blame Boileau for moral neutralization of Sappho's original.

The third unbowdlerized translation, or rather a series of translations, of the Ode was made by a giant of the eighteenth century Russian literature—Gavriil Derzhavin. Derzhavin seems to have been fascinated by the power of Sappho's passion and lyricism. He worked on his translations of the Ode for years, producing several versions of the poem (including draft translations).

Let us look at Derzhavin's translations. He made several translations of the O~~o~~de in the 1790s. The first version was made on the basis of Boileau's translation while the later versions were made on the basis of an interlinear translation. In the first version (see a~~A~~ppendix 5, below),[21] ~~;~~ the narrator is definitely female. The third line of the third stanza runs as follows: "В восторгах сладостных вся млею, вся горю" (In sweet delights, I am melting, I am burning), where вся (all, entire) is a feminine adjectival pronoun. In the closing line, the narrator is described as *лишена чувств* (devoid of feelings), where the participle *лишена* (devoid) is feminine. The adjective *счастлив* (happy) in the first stanza is masculine. Although it can be interpreted as the generalizing masculine, like in Zhukovskii's first stanza analyzed above, this option should be ruled out because the drama is shown as unfolding between the female narrator, somebody who is happy ~~with~~ and somebody else who has a "sweet smile" (see line 4 in the first stanza: "И сладкою твоей улыбкой тайно тает" [And is melting from you sweet smile]). The situation is rendered as it is shown in Boileau: "Qui te void quelquefois doucement lui soûrire"

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [NT7]: Text OK here? Shouldn't there be at least two parties between whom this drama is unfolding? Please review/clarify.

(Who sees you sometimes tenderly smile to him). The sweet smile is a detail of Sappho's description of the girl, object of her passion. Thus, Derzhavin's female narrator is also shown to be in love with a woman.

It may come as a surprise that in his second variant (see aAppendix 6, below),[22]), Derzhavin, while keeping the masculine gender in the reference to the male (*блажен* [blessed]), *сидящий* [sitting], and *внемлющий* [listening/looking]) and the feminine features of the girl (*сладчайшие уста* [the sweetest mouth] and *улыбка нежная* [tender smile]), did not keep any signs of the feminine for the narrator. This was probably done because in the second version Derzhavin focused on capturing the dynamics of the description of passion. It is, however, hardly an attempt to bowdlerize Sappho's original—after all, in his previous versions, Derzhavin had shown his intention to reproduce Sappho's lesbian passion without any censorship or judgment.

Derzhavin's translations contributed to the introduction of love or, more precisely, sexual passion into the Russian literature and an unconventional sexual passion, at that—lesbian passion. Making lesbian passion an object of literature, he, thus, questioned the existing norms of sexuality. In Luhmannian terms, his translations operated according to the requirements of the variation stage of the social-systemic evolutionary cycle.

Imitating Male Homoerotic Poetry

In the present section, I will discuss a puzzling poem, *Подражание Арабскому* (*An Imitation of the Arabic*) (1835), by Aleksandr Pushkin (1799–1837).[23] This short poem is one of the most exquisite examples of literary male homoeroticism (see aAppendix 7, below).[24]) One can only speculate why Pushkin wrote it. His interest in this topic may have been prompted by Orientalism, the interest in Middle Eastern cultures and arts, which was gaining popularity in the early nineteenth century, as well as by literary cosmopolitanism, influenced by French translations of Arabic poetry, notably by Saadi, available at the time in Russia. All-male schools

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [NT8]: Dates necessary? You haven't given dates for anyone else. Please review.

in late eighteenth- and nineteenth--century Russia, with their encouragement of homosocial relations, not without homoerotic undertones, à la the mores of British boarding schools, were, perhaps, another factor which that might have influenced Pushkin.

The poem has not been discussed as toin terms of its homoerotic content in any of the critical works of Russian or wWestern studies of Pushkin. For instance, all many comments may focus on the discussion of whether Saadi was the source of the epigraph of another Pushkin poem, —*Bakhchisaraiskii fontan* (*The Fountain of Bakhchisarai*).[25] Pushkinists seem to be puzzled by such a poem coming from a heterosexual poet like Pushkin. Yet this poem is Pushkin's contribution to the introduction of homoerotic lyricism into Russian literature, and on a high level of poetic artistry, at that.

The poem was written by the mature Pushkin. It had nothing to do with his earlier, rather derisive treatment of male homosexuality, as one finds in the epigram *На Кн. А. Н. Голицына* (*On Prince A. N. Golitsyn*), composed in 1820 (aAppendix 8, below).[26]

It is interesting that in one of the drafts of *An Imitation of the Arabic*, Pushkin apparently had a quite conventional heterosexual variant:

Отрок милый, отрок нежный,
Я твоя, навек ты мой;
В край безлюдный, в степи снежны
Я готова за тобой.

(Oh, sweet boy, gentle boy, I am yours and you are forever mine. I am ready to follow you into a desert or into snowy steppes.)

The narrator in the draft version is a female,: "Я твоя[. . .]Я готова[. . .]" (I am yours . . . I am ready), . . .] where the modifiers are in the feminine grammatical gender. But Pushkin

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [NT9]: Difference between A.H. and A.N. OK? Shouldn't they be the same?

Comment [st10]: OK: 'H' is in Russian and 'N' is in English

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Russian

Comment [st11]: In this translation it is impossible to keep the Russian syntax (in lines 3 and 4), so that if line breaks are inserted line 3 in English will be actually line 4 and v.v. Since it is not important here and will only confuse the reader who does not know Russian and will be superfluous for somebody who can read Russian, I think it's best not to have line breaks here.

Comment [NT12]: Lack of line breaks in the English OK? Please review.

changes the text so that no indication of the sex of the narrator is provided. Consequently, coming from a male poet, the poem reads as a male homoerotic lyric. Pushkin's taking out clear indications of the female narration corroborates such male homoerotic interpretation or, at least, conspicuously allows it.

Let us not forget that the genre of the poem is not a translation but rather an imitation. That is to say, Pushkin did not have to follow any original that might have imposed on him the *male–male* relationship. Whatever choice he made was *his* choice. The poem would still allow for conventional interpretations ~~of the poem~~ as ~~one~~ a work telling us about male friends, ~~if it~~ were it not for the motif of *shame–mockery*: "Не стыдись ~~[~~. . . ~~]~~Не боюся я насмешек" ~~[. . .~~(Do not be ashamed . . . I am not afraid of mockery~~. . .]~~). That is why the poem does not allow reading it as a description of a heterosexual relationship~~,~~ either: why would people mock such a relationship?

One of the possible sources of Pushkin's inspiration for this poem might have been a phrase from Musharif al-Din Saadi's *Gulistan*, where the narrator remembers that he and his male friend used to live like two kernels in one almond shell ~~(cChap.ter 5V, p.: VIII8)~~. .But Pushkin, characteristically, added the *shame–mockery* motif. Why? Nobody would ever mock a two-male friendship. Pushkin himself had a voluminous corpus of poems addressed to his male friends. This leads us to doubt the unequivocal interpretation of the poem as a description of friendship.

Comment [NT13]: OK? Is this what these numbers meant? If so, why isn't this cited in a note? Please review/clarify why this is here.

Comment [st14]: 5 and 8 stood for the numbers of the chapter and stanza in Saadi's Gulistan. Probably they can be simply deleted if they only confuse rather than clarify about a possible source of Pushkin's inspiration.

Another source of this poem might have been Plato's *Symposium*.[27] There is a hint at Aristophanes's speech in Plato's *Symposium* with a deliberate reference to homosexuality. This possibility is corroborated by Pushkin's ~~very~~ good knowledge of Greco-Roman a~~A~~ntiquity, which was an important part of his curriculum in Lyceum, the school where he studied in Tsarskoe Selo, and a major part of the Russian and European culture, the immediate context of his literary career.

Also, Pushkin translated Catullus's *Minister vetuli puer Falerni* (1832) (a~~A~~ppendix 9, see

below).[28] ~~).~~ It is known that this translation was made by Pushkin as a challenge to Konstantin Batiushkov's interpretation of this poem. Batiushkov wrote that Catullus showed in his poem that the human heart, even in the highest blessing, strives for something bitter. Pushkin disagreed with that abstract philosophical interpretation by composing his ~~directly~~ Anacreontic, hedonist translation.[29] Pushkin seems to bring Batiushkov's conventionally European philosophical interpretation down to earth. He shows a feast (*symposium*), with its Epicureanism and pleasure seeking. And ancient artistic evidence strongly suggests that symposia (drinking parties) were, among other things, "a locus of homosexual admiration, courtship, and even sexual acts," and participants of these feasts ogled serving beautiful boys who tended to their duties naked.[30] Could the translation of Catullus's poem have been a step leading toward~~s~~ *An Imitation of the Arabic*?

Comment [NT15]: Correct, or "better"?

Comment [NT16]: Italics OK here?

Comment [st17]: It can be roman; italics are not necessary.

Pushkin cleverly opened Russian literary space on both ends—to the West and the East. *An Imitation* may be viewed as a combination of two traditions—Oriental and Greco-Roman. It was not unusual for Pushkin to merge the two. In his famous *Памятник* (~~*Monument*~~), which is another translation—imitation, Pushkin drew on Horace's *Exegi monumentum* and probably on Saadi as well.[31] What is certain about Pushkin's *An Imitation of the Arabic* is that it worked as a skillful translation of the variation stage of the social-systemic evolutionary cycle challenging the dominant heterosexual discourse. In other words, Pushkin's poem introduced the type of sexuality not openly discussed in society.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Translating Sexualities in Order to Challenge Dominant (Religious) Discourse

Another type of translation involving sexuality aimed at undermining the prevalent social religious discourse. Examples of this sort are, once again, found among Pushkin's works. Pushkin is often considered *the* poet in Russia and not infrequently credited with creating the modern Russian language and literature. Among other things, he did so by adapting many plots

and poetic devices from foreign literatures and introducing them into the then young Russian literature. Among those who exerted a considerable influence on Pushkin were Voltaire and Evariste de Parny with their caustic satire. This influence is especially obvious in Pushkin's long poems *Монах* (*Monk*) (1813)[32] and *Гавриилиада* (*Gavriiliada*) (1821).[33] Yet another risqué long poem, *Царь Никита* (*Czar Nikita*)~~]~~ (1822~~; Pushkin 1947~~),[34]~~,~~ shows another source of Pushkin's inspiration: Russian folklore. In all three, Pushkin's derisive treatment of sexuality is made manifest through his burlesque techniques.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Monk is based on a hagiography of the Russian Orthodox figure Ioann Novgorodskii, although other sources may have also inspired the precocious creativity of Pushkin, an adolescent at the time ~~of~~ he composed~~ing~~ the poem. The story is about the erotic temptations of an anchorite. Pushkin's attitude is mocking throughout. In the introductory section, he says that he does not want to mount Pegasus or to invoke Muses and thereby make them lose their chastity ("Я не хочу из муз наделать дам" [I do not want to make Muses dames]).[35]~~).~~ Already in that phrase, Pushkin's risqué humor manifests itself quite clearly. Pushkin also turns for inspiration to Voltaire, "Султан французского Парнаса" (~~[~~the Sultan of French Parnassus)~~]~~ and the major inspirer of Pushkin in the period of writing *Монах* (~~[~~*Monk*)~~]~~, especially with his *La Pucelle d'Orleans*, but Voltaire refuses to lend Pushkin his lyre: "Ты хмуришься и говоришь: не дам" (~~[~~You are frowning and saying: I will not lend~~]~~). Then Pushkin, without much hesitation, turns to the well-known "bawdy" Russian poet Barkov, whom he describes as a poet who was cursed by Apollo, ~~and~~ who dirtied walls of drinking houses, ~~moreover~~and~~,~~ who fell under Mount Helicon together with Villon. Barkov willingly offers the young poet his fiddle, some wine, and a muse "half-virgin" (музу пол-девицу). And though eventually Pushkin turns down Barkov's offer and makes the decision "to sing whatever comes into his head" (Я стану петь, что в голову придется ~~[. . .]~~), his treatment of the subject echoes, although to a considerably lesser degree, Barkov's bawdiness.

Formatted: Font: Italic

The plot is built on demon Moloch's tempting a monk with the vision of a skirt and then,

when the monk sleeps, in his dream, with a girl for whom the monk falls. Although the motif of tempting a saint with items of female clothing is well--known in world literature, Pushkin handles it not just by mentioning the white skirt which appears before the monk Pankratii, the protagonist of his poem, but also by providinges a longish lyrical ~~longish~~ digression describing the skirt as the most seductive item of the woman's clothing for him personally. The poet ends up the digression invoking Love ("Одушеви перо мое, любовь!" [Inspire my pen, Love!]),[36] ~~),~~ yet his version of love seems closer to lust. It is also lust that makes the monk, in his dream, "chaise a girl like a light horse" ("Как легкий конь, за девкою погнался").[37] ~~).~~ In sum, "the story is treated with accentuated eroticism to produce an anti-clerical burlesque."[38] Pushkin~~,~~ thus, with his secularism, contributed to undermining the dominant ethic religious code.

Comment [NT18]: OK, or should this be "chase"?

Pushkin's poem may be considered an intercultural transfer of Voltaire's anti-clericalism and intracultural transfer of Barkov's bawdiness. At that, Pushkin's rendering aimed against the state-cum-church establishment by employing translation techniques of the variation stage: his choice of the original story and the imitation of Voltaire and Barkov, and his treatment of a religious subject with the help of inter/intracultural translations, undermined the dominant discourse of the social system, wherein the only officially acceptable attitude to religion was reverence. Since religion was a vital part of the state ideology, ""~~"~~disrespectful"" treatment of religion was tantamount to questioning the ideological foundation of the state.

Monk became a first experiment followed by later similar works, and perhaps the best known among them is Pushkin's blasphemous *Gavriiliada*, where he satirized the biblical story of the Annunciation. *Gavriiliada* draws on both Voltaire's *La Pucelle d'Orleans* (if somewhat distantly) and more directly on Parny's *La Guerre des Dieux*, principally on the episode of the seduction of Mary. Sexuality serves as a means to trivialize the biblical story. In the Bible, God is omniscient and virtuous, his angels are faithful servants, and only the devil is evil. On the contrary, all of Pushkin's characters are lustful. Pushkin shows Virgin Mary as a young voluptuous woman. The comic effect is achieved, however, by her eagerness to relinquish her

chastity by giving herself to three lovers one after another. The Virgin's innocence is only apparent, for it deceives the gullible Almighty and Joseph, but the devil ~~or~~ and Gabriel know better.[39] Joseph and God considered Mary a virgin, yet before the Holy Spirit as a dove came to her to conceive the future Messiah, the devil and Gabriel had already had their way with her. The consequences of the story retold in this way shattered the very foundation of Christian credo—the virginity of Mary, which ensured the undefiled conception of the Messiah.

The facetious tone manifests itself especially in the description~~s such as when~~ of how Mary lets the devil seduce her[40]:

Она молчит: но вдруг не стало мочи,
Закрылися блистательные очи,
К лукавому склонив на грудь главу,
Вскричала: ах! . . . и пала на траву~~...~~

[She is silent: but suddenly there was no more strength, the shining eyes closed, and, putting her head on the devil's chest, she cried out: ah! . . . and fell down on the grass~~. . .~~][40]

Formatted: Russian

Comment [NT19]: Lack of line breaks in the English OK?

Pushkin plays not only on contrasts in imagery, ~~he not only~~ depict~~ings~~ the seduction in vivid colors and with handpicked details; he also cleverly juxtaposes the high stylistic register, the Church~~—~~Slavonic vocabulary, such words ~~as~~ with *очи* (~~[~~eyes~~)]~~ in the cited excerpt, thereby creating a deceptively romanticized description, with a quite prosaic context: he suddenly ends the passage with the revealing phrase "~~. . .~~and fell down on the grass~~. . .~~." Such juxtapositions lower the tone, stripping Mary's portrayal of any sentimental veneer—there is no love in her, just lust. This effect is so much more striking as it is applied to the biblical story of the Annunciation, the paragon of purity and sinlessness.

A folkloristic spin with the same attitude toward sexuality is observed in Pushkin's fairy tale *Czar Nikita*. The poem may be interpreted as a covert intralingual and intracultural transfer of Russian folkloristic stylistics;[41] it serves as yet another form of evidence that sexuality bordering on ribaldry, undermining the revered religious discourse, is among Pushkin's most favorite satirical devices against clerics and the authorities supporting them. Symptomatically, in *Czar Nikita*, while puzzled how to say that Nikita's daughters did not have vaginas without running the risk of being censored, Pushkin refers to the official censorship as "богомольная важная дура, слишком чопорная цензура" (the God-praying proud fool, too prudish a censorship).[42] Pushkin's intention in *Czar Nikita* is the same "as for erotic literature in general: unlike pornography, which is, as a rule, affirmative, erotic poetry is borne of an emancipatory impetus which can extend from a general attack on religious or social sexual taboos [. . .]."[43]

Comment [NT20]: Right word, or "born"? Please review.

This fairy-tale is another example of Pushkin's undermining by means of translation the official sexuality discourse of the religion-induced social mores by means of translation. Pushkin's strategy is, mutatis mutandis, not unlike the change in viewing descriptions of male and female genitalia in folklore: initially they correlate with their demonstration in rituals because they are understood as real or symbolic means which are capable of ensuring fertility or protecting people from hostile forces. In a Russian ritual, while sowing seeds, a male dropped his pants to imitate coitus with the soil, or while calling for rain, a female would undress. When these meanings were lost, the ritualistic nakedness turned into an offensive practice or an object of derision.[44] In a similar fashion, Pushkin empties sexuality of any serious meaning and uses it as a purely comical device.

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Conclusion

As has been demonstrated, the problem of translating sexualities in Russia taken in its historical perspective deserves more attention than it has so far been granted. I have considered a range of

translation strategies employed to render literary works with a distinct sexual component within the specific context of the history of the secularization of Russia in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The purpose was to take stock of the strategies and outline the major tendencies, rather than examine in detail the resulting translations.

~~More~~ Further studies are needed and ~~more~~ many other texts should undergo close inspection to draw more encompassing conclusions. But even the provided examples show that translating sexualities is an important gauge for the social function of translation. Translation should not be theorized in a narrow sense of transferring texts only into another linguistic code, for sometimes, as was the case with Sumarokov's, Zhukovskii's, and Pushkin's imitations, translation may take the form of another kind of transfer—imitation or adaptation. The discourse of sexuality~~,~~ thus~~,~~ proves helpful in broadening the horizons of the existing translation theory.

Comment [NT21]: Possible to reword to avoid repeating "more" so many times? Please review.

Translating sexuality is one of the most radical zones of challenging the dominant cultural discourse, as has been shown in the case of eighteenth- and ~~-~~nineteenth~~-~~-century Russia. Introducing sexualities into literature and, thereby, into the socially acceptable official discourse was far from easy or straightforward. Translators and writers ~~(-translators)~~ made use of a range of strategies—from the neutralization of the sexual "radicalism" of translated texts to a faithful rendering of the unconventional sexualities frontally challenging the target system's mores. Sexuality in the analyzed translations was treated, on the one hand, seriously and empathetically and, on the other hand, with provocative levity. The sensitive nature of the theme of sexuality made clashes between the dominant, the conventional, the orthodox, on the one hand, and the radically new, on the other, a showcase of different approaches to translation as a significant factor of social innovation.

Formatted: Not Highlight

~~Translating sexualities in such secularizing culture as post-Petrine Russia ran the whole gamut of strategies—from downright bowdlerization through faithful and sympathetic renderings to embracing new stylistic techniques, artistic devices, and points of view. To be sure, these strategies and the range thereof are not unique to translating sexualities. However, t~~The social

significance of ~~these~~ the described strategies is perhaps brought into a sharper relief in that in such societies ~~as~~ strongly influenced by Abrahamic religions as post-Petrine Russia, sexuality and its open discussion often cause stronger reactions on the part of the target audience and, in translation, require a larger variety of both conventional and radical translation strategies, than are some other topics. Translations of works introducing sexualities make social conflicts more evident in target social systems.

My claim in this ~~essay~~ article is that translating sexualities in secularizing, Christian-based cultures, in general, and literatures, in particular, is an important feature of the overall social dynamics. ~~Translation may introduce new options of discourse directly (translating literary works with sexual components influencing the social awareness and tolerating conventional or unconventional sexualities) or indirectly (imitations or pseudo-translations). All types of sexuality are involved in the process, both homo- and hetero- as well as their intersections (as was the case of Derzhavin's or Pushkin's poetry). Such t~~Translations manifests ~~themselves~~ itself as a conduit~~s~~ for ~~translation's~~ revolutionary potential and thus significantly contributes to the evolution of the society in question.

Comment [NT22]: Again, too much repetition of this point? Please review.

Durham University

Notes

1. For example, Simon Karlinsky, "Introduction: Russia's Gay Literature and History," in ~~Kevin Moss, ed., ~~*Out of the Blue: Russia's Hidden Gay Literature~~:~~ ~~*An Anthology*, ed. Kevin Moss (San Francisco: Gay Sunshine Press, 1997), 15–26; Dan Healey, *Homosexual Desire in Revolutionary Russia* (Chicago~~ and London~~: ~~The University of Chicago Press, 2001); Leonid Heller, ed., *Amour et érotisme dans la littérature russe du XXe siècle* (Bern~~, Berlin, Frankfurt/M., New York, Paris, Wien~~: Peter Lang, 1992); Simon Karlinsky, *The Sexual Labyrinth of Nikolai Gogol* (Cambridge,~~ MA~~Massachusetts, and London, UK~~: Harvard University Press, 1976).

2. Healey, *Homosexual Desire in Revolutionary Russia*, 1.

3. Stephen O. Murray, *Homosexualities* (Chicago~~ and London~~: ~~The University of Chicago Press, 2000), 1.

4. Niklas Luhmann, *Social Systems*, trans. John Bednarz, Jr., with Dirk Baecker (Stanford, ~~California~~CA: Stanford University Press, 1995); Niklas Luhmann, *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1997).

5. Sergey Tyulenev, *Applying Luhmann to Translation Studies: Translation in Society* (New York~~ and London~~: Routledge, 2012), 158–68.

6. Sergey Tyulenev, *Translation and the Westernization of Eighteenth-Century Russia: A Social-Systemic Perspective* (Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2012), 84, 230.

7. Nikolai Smirnov-Sokol'skii, *Russkie literaturnye almanakhi i sborniki 18–19 vv.* [*Russian Literary Almanacs and Collections of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*] (Moscow: Kniga, 1965).

8. Aleksandr Panchenko, "O smene pisatel'skogo tipa v petrovskuiu epokhu" ["On the Change of the Writer's Type in Peter's Epoch"], in *XVIII vek* [*Eighteenth~~18~~th Century*], vol. 9 (Leningrad: Nauka, 1974), ~~Volume 9:~~ 112–28.

9. David H. Lawrence, *Pornography and So On* (London: Faber and Faber, 1936), 23.

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

10. Sergey Tyulenev, *Teoriia perevoda* [*Theory of Translation*] (Moscow: Gardariki, 2004), 42–75.

11. Luhmann, *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft*, 456–505.

12. For the applicability of Luhmann's term "social system" to eighteenth-century Russia, see Tyulenev, *Translation and the Westernization of Eighteenth-Century Russia*, 85–88.

13. Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (1995; repr., London and New York: Routledge, 2008/1995).

14. Evgenii Sviiasov, *Safo i russkaia liubovnaia poeziia 18–nachala 20 vekov [Sappho and the Russian Love Poetry of the Eighteenth Century through the Beginning of the Twentieth Century*] (Saint-Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 2003).

15. Borrowed from [Boileau, Nicolas Boileau], *Oeuvres Diverses Du Sieur D*** avec Le Traité du Sublime ou Du Merveilleux dans le Discours: Traduit du Grec de Longin* (Paris: Chez Denys Thierry, (M. DC. LXXIV1674), 24–26.

16. Aleksandr Sumarokov, *Izbrannye proizvedeniia* [*Selected Works*] (Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1957), 101.

17. As cited in Gavriil Derzhavin, *Sochineniia Derzhavina s ob"iasnitel'nymi primechaniiami Ia. Grota*, Volume vol. 2II (Saint-Petersburg: St. Petersburg Saint-Petersburg Academy of Sciences Press, 1865), 44.

18. Sviiasov, *Safo i russkaia liubovnaia poeziia 18—nachala 20 vekov*, 47.

19. Sergey Tyulenev, "Translation as Smuggling," in James St. André, ed., *Thinking Through Translation with Metaphors*, ed. James St. André (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishers, 2010), 241–74.

20. Sviiasov, *Safo i russkaia liubovnaia poeziia 18–nachala 20 vekov*, 76.

21. Derzhavin, *Sochineniia Derzhavina*, 39.

22. Ibid.Derzhavin, *Sochineniia Derzhavina*, 42.

23. Michael Green described this poem as a Pushkin's puzzle. See his article of the same

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

name. "A Pushkin Puzzle," in *Out of the Blue*, ed. Moss, 30–35.

24. Aleksandr Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii A. S. Pushkina v shestnadtsati tomakh, Tom tretii, Kniga 1* [*Complete Works by A. Pushkin in Ssixteen Volumes*, vVol. 3III, bBook. 1] (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1948), 411.

25. Aleksandr Pushkin, *Perevody i podrazhaniia* (*Translations and Imitations*) (Moscow: Raduga, 1999).

26. Aleksandr Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii A. S. Pushkina v shestnadtsati tomakh, Tom vtoroi, Kniga 1* [*Complete Works by A. Pushkin in Sixteen Volumes*, vol. 2, bk. 1] (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1947), 127.

27. Gregory Woods, "Literary Historiography and the Gay Common Reader," *Nordlit*, 4 (1998, 4): 131–45.

28. Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* [*Complete Works by A. Pushkin*, vol. 2, bk. 1], 283.

29. Sergei Kibal'nik, "Katull v russkoi poezii 18–pervoi treti 19 veka" ["Catullus in the Russian Poetry of the Eeighteenth and the Ffirst Tthird of the Nnineteenth Ceentury"], in M. Alekseev, *Vzaimosviazi russkoi i zarubezhnoi literatur* [*Interrelationship of the Russian and Foreign Literatures*], ed. M. Alekseev (Leningrad: Nauka, 1983), 66.

30. Thomas K. Hubbard, ed., *Homosexuality in Greece and Rome: A Sourcebook of Basic Documents* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 4.

31. Nadezhda Lobikova, *Pushkin i Vostok* [*Pushkin and the Orient*] (Moscow: Nauka, 1974).

32. Aleksandr Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii A. S. Pushkina v shestnadtsati tomakh, Tom pervyi* [*Complete Works by A. Pushkin in Sixteen Volumes*, vol. 1] (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1937), 9–20.

33. Aleksandr Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii A. S. Pushkina v shestnadtsati tomakh, Tom chetvertyi* [*Complete Works by A. Pushkin in Sixteen Volumes*, vol. 4] (Moscow:

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [NT23]: Is Alekseev the author of this book, as you have it here, or the editor? Please review.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [NT24]: OK, or should this be *Pushkin and the Orient*? Please review.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [st25]: No book number. Some of the volumes of Pushkin's Complete Works were divided into books, some not. This one was not.

Comment [NT26]: Prior citations from this source also gave a book number, but the next few here do not. Can this be standardized one way or the other? Please review.

Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1937), 119–36.

34. Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* [*Complete Works by A. Pushkin*, vol. 2, bk. 1], 248–54.

35. The following citations from *Monk* are based on the text of the following edition: Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* [*Complete Works by A. Pushkin*, vol. 4], 9.

36. Ibid.~~Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* [Complete Works, Vol. IV] (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1937)~~, 12.

37. ~~Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* [Complete Works, Vol. IV] (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1937)~~Ibid., 15.

38. J. Douglas Clayton, *Wave and Stone*: ~~:~~ *Essays on the Poetry and Prose of Alexander Pushkin* (Ottawa: ~~The~~ Slavic Research Group at the University of Ottawa, 2000), 7.

39. Ibid.~~Clayton, *Wave and Stone*~~, 32–36.

40. Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* [*Complete Works by A. Pushkin*, vol. 4], 137.

41. Dagmar Burkhart, "The Erotic Tradition in Russia: Pushkin and his Fairy-Tale 'Czar Nikita,'" in *Eros in Folklore*, ed. M. Hoppal and E. Csonka-Takacs (Budapest: Akadmiai Kiado, European Folklore Institute, 2002), 101–24.

42. Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* [*Complete Works by A. Pushkin*, vol. 2, bk. 1], 248.

43. Burkhart, "Erotic Tradition in Russia," 112.

44. ~~Toporkov,~~ Andrei Toporkov, ed., *Russkii eroticheskii fol'klor* [*Russian Erotic Folklore*], Moscow: Ladomir, 1995), 16–17.

Appendices

(The sources for the following poems have been given in the footnotes above, and all translations are the author's.)

1. Sappho, Second Ode (Fragment 31):

((The man, who sits close to you and listens to you speaking so sweetly and laughing so charmingly, seems to me equal to gods themselves. My heart flutters in my breast, because, as soon as I see you, I become incapable of uttering a sound, my tongue is as if broken; and suddenly a delicate fire runs under my skin. My eyes cannot see; my ears roar; cold sweat pours down me; my body trembles. I am paler than grass and I feel as if I am about to die.))

2. Boileau:

Heureux! qui prés de toi, pour toi seule soûpire:
Qui joüit du plaisir de t'entendre parler:
Qui te void quelquefois doucement lui soûrire.
Les Dieux, dans son bon-heur peuvent-ils l'égaler?

Je sens de veine en veine une subtile flame
Courir par tout mon corps, si tost que je te vois:
Et dans les doux transports, où s'égare mon ame,
Je ne sçaurois trouver de langue, ni de voix.

Un nuage confus se répand sur ma veuë,

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Comment [NT27]: No line breaks, as with the English translations below?

Comment [st28]: No line breaks

Comment [NT29]: Title for this, like the other appendix headings?

Comment [st30]: No title as Boileau's translation had no title and was part of a larger text.

Je n’entends plus, je tombe en de douces langueurs,

Et passe, sans haleine, interdite, éperduë,

Un frisson me saisit, je tremble, je me meurs.

({Happy is he who is beside you, sighing for you alone;~~ /~~ ~~Who~~ who enjoys the pleasure of listening to you; ~~/ W~~who sees you sometimes smile tenderly. ~~/~~ Gods, can they in his happiness be equal to him?~~ //~~ I sense a subtle flame from vein to vein~~ /~~ ~~Running~~ running over my entire body, as soon as I see you; ~~/ A~~and in tender raptures, in which my soul loses itself, ~~/~~ I cannot find neither my tongue, nor my voice. ~~//~~ A blurring cloud spreads over my sight, ~~/~~ I can no longer hear, I fall in tender weakness ~~/ A~~and pass, breathless, rejected, overwhelmed, s~~/ S~~hiver seizes me, I am trembling, I am dying.)~~}~~

3. Sumarokov, *Ода сафическая* (~~{~~*Sapphic Ode*)~~}~~:

Comment [NT31]: The text renders this as *сафическая*, which is showing up as a different word in my spellcheck. Are these in fact different? Please review/standardize.

ST: Corrected in the main body of the text. Here the spelling is correct.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Russian

Долго ль мучить будешь ты, грудь терзая?

Рань ты сердце сильно, его пронзая.

Рань меня ты, только не рань к несчастью,

Пленного страстью.

Зрак твой в мысли, властвуя, обитает,

Непрестанно сердце тобою тает;

Весь наполнен ум мой тобой единой,

Муки причиной.

Будь причиной, вместо того, утехи,

Воздыханья ты преврати мне в смехи,

Люты преврати мне печали в радость,

Горести — в сладость!

Дай надежды сердцу, драгая, боле,

Облегченье тяжкой моей неволе.

Иль надежды тщетно себе желаю,

Тщетно пылаю.

Отгони ты прочь беспокойно время,

Сбрось с меня тобой возложенно бремя,

Премени, сложив сей тяжелый камень,

Хлад свой ты в пламень!

Будь хоть мало жару сему причастна,

Будь хоть меньше мной, как тобой я, страстна,

Тай, моей ты нежности отвечая,

Взоры встречая.

Нет терпети больше страданья мочи;

Обрати ко мне дорогие очи

И введи меня ты из жизни слезной

В мысли любезной!

((How long will you torture me, tormenting my heart? / Wound it strongly, pierce it. / Wound me, but do not wound as to grieve me, m/ Me, captivated by passion. // Your image dwells, lording it over, in my thought, t/ The heart constantly is melted by you; m/ My entire mind is full only by you, / the cause of my torture. // Be the passion, instead of that, of pleasure, t/ Turn my

sighs into laughter, / Tturn my heavy sadness into joy, / Bbitterness into sweetness! // Give more hope to my heart, my dear, / Rrelief from my heavy captivity. / Or I want to have hope for myself in vain, /i In vain I am burning. // Chase away the troublesome time, t/ Throw off me the burden you have put, c/ Change, by taking down this heavy stone, y/ Your coldness into flame! // Be sharing at least some of this fire, / Bbe passionate, at least lesser than me, for me, / Mmelt, reciprocating my tenderness, / Wwhen meeting my eyes. // I cannot suffer any longer; / Tturn your dear eyes to me / Aand lead me out of the life of tears / Iinto the one that is dear to my thought!)]

4. Zhukovskii, *Сафина Ода ([Sappho's Ode)]:*

Formatted: Font: Italic

Блажен, кто близ тебя одним тобой пылает,

Formatted: Russian

Кто прелестью твоих речей обворожен,

Кого твой ищет взор, улыбка восхищает:

С богами он сравнен!

Когда ты предо мной,—в душе моей волненье,

В крови палящий огнь, в очах померкнул свет;

В трепещущей груди и скорбь и наслажденье;

Ни слов, ни чувства нет!

Лежу у милых ног,—горю огнем желанья,

Блаженством страстныя тоски утомлена!

В слезах, вся трепещу, без силы, без дыханья,

И жизни лишена!

([Blessed is the one who is beside you, burning for you alone, / Wwho is bewitched with the beauty of your words, / Wwho is searched for by your look, whose smile enchants you: / Hhe is comparable to gods! // When you are in front of me, there is excitement in my soul, / scorching fire in my blood; there is no more light in my eyes; i/ In the heaving chest, there is both grief and enjoyment; / Tthere are neither words, nor senses. // As I am lying at the dear feet, I am burning with desire, / I am exhausted with the bliss of passionate longing! / In tears, I am all trembling, without strength, without breath, / Aand devoid of life!)]

5. Derzhavin, *Из Сафо ([From Sappho)]*, Variant 1[:

Счастлив, подобится в блаженстве тот богам,
Кто близ тебя сидит и по тебе вздыхает,
С тобой беседует, тебе внимает сам
И сладкою твоей улыбкой тайно тает.

Я чувствую в тот миг, когда тебя узрю,
Тончайший огнь и мраз, из жил текущий в жилы;
В восторгах сладостных вся млею, вся горю,
Ни слов не нахожу, ни голоса, ни силы.

Густая, темна мгла мой взор объемлет вкруг;
Не слышу ничего, не вижу и не знаю:
В оцепенении едва дышу—и вдруг,
Лишенна чувств, дрожу, бледнею, умираю.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Russian

({Happy is he, in his bliss is like gods, / Wwho is sitting beside you and is sighing for you, / is talking with you, is listening to you himself / And and is melting from you sweet smile. // I feel in that moment, when I see you, / Tthe finest flame and frost, flowing from veins to veins; / Iin sweet delights, I am melting entirely, I am burning entirely, / I can find neither words, nor voice, nor strength. // Dense, black darkness encircles me around; / I neither hear, nor see, nor know anything: i/ In stupefaction, I can hardly breathe—and suddenly, /d Devoid of feelings, I am trembling, paling, dying.)}

6. Derzhavin, *Из Сафо ({From Sappho)}*, Variant 2H:

Formatted: Font: Italic

Блажен, подобится богам

Formatted: Russian

С тобой сидящий в разговорах,

Сладчайшим внемлющий устам,

Улыбке нежной в страстных взорах!

Увижу ль я сие,—и вмиг

Трепещет сердце, груд теснится,

Немеет речь в устах моих

И молния по мне стремится.

По слуху шум, по взорам мрак,

По жилам хлад я ощущаю;

Дрожу, бледнею—и, как злак

Упадший, вяну, умираю.

({Blessed, comparable to gods is he w/ Who is sitting with you, talking, /listening to the sweetest mouth,/ looking at your tender smile in passionate looks! // If I see this—immediately/ My my heart is trembling, the chest is as if squeezed, m/ My speech is mute in my mouth / A and lightening is running over me.// There is noise in my hearing, darkness in my eyes, /I sense cold in my veins; /I am trembling, paling—and like a fruit t/ That has fallen down, I am wilting, dying.)}

Comment [NT32]: Spelling OK, or "lightning"?

7. Pushkin, *Подражание Арабскому* ({*An Imitation of the Arabic*)}:

Formatted: Font: Italic

Отрок милый, отрок нежный,

Не стыдись, навек ты мой;

Тот же в нас огонь мятежный,

Жизнью мы живем одной.

Не боюся я насмешек:

Мы сдвоились меж собой,

Мы точь-в-точь двойной орешек

Под единой скорлупой.

Formatted: Russian

({Oh, sweet boy, gentle boy, do not be ashamed, you are forever mine. We share the same restless flame and live the same life. I am not afraid of mockery: we, two of us, became one, we are exactly like a doubled kernel -under the same nutshell.)}

Comment [NT33]: No line breaks for this English? Please review.

8. Pushkin, *На Кн. А. Н. Голицына* ({*On Prince A. N. Golitsyn*)}:

Comment [NT34]: Please see prior queries about AH vs. AN.

Comment [st35]: Correct

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Вот Хвостовой покровитель,

Вот холопская душа,

Formatted: Russian

Просвещения губитель,

Покровитель Бантыша!

Напирайте, бога ради,

На него со всех сторон!

Не попробовать ли сзади?

Там всего слабее он.

({Here he is, Khvostova's patron. Here he is, a slavish soul, a destroyer of all education, Bantysh's patron, too. Press on him from all sides! Shall we try him from behind? That's his weakest point.)}

Comment [NT36]: Again, no line breaks?

9. Pushkin, *Мальчику* (*To a Boy*):

Formatted: Font: Italic

Пьяной горечью Фалерна

Чашу мне наполни, мальчик!

Formatted: Russian

Так Постумия велела,

Председательница оргий.

Вы же, воды, прочь теките

И струей, вину враждебной,

Строгих постников поите:

Чистый нам любезен Бахус.

({Hey boy, fill up my cup with the drunken bitterness of Falernum! This is the order of Postumia, the governess of orgies. And you, waters, flow away and with streams, hostile to wine, fill strict abstainers—we prefer pure Bacchus.)}

Comment [NT37]: Please see prior queries about line breaks.