

Nicholas Žekulin

Turgenev as Translator

ABSTRACT: Ivan Turgenev's activity as a translator was very extensive and spanned his entire career. It is, however, little known and less studied. Not only have most of his translations not been republished, but a comprehensive list, detailing his role and participation, has never been compiled. His translations *into* Russian (most of which have been republished) were done primarily out of personal interest in the author or the work in question, or out of close friendship (Maria Markovich, song texts for Pauline Viardot, Gustave Flaubert). His translations into other languages, mostly translations from Russian into French, were part of his efforts at making Russian literature, including his own works, better known outside of Russia. These translations were generally done in collaboration and provide insight into his views on translation, views which, within certain parameters, gave surprising leeway to the translator.

It was the well-known Turgenev scholar Mikhail Alekseev who described Turgenev as "a propagandist for Russian literature in the West,"¹ but Turgenev's position as Russia's best-known author outside of Russia provided him with the opportunity and the means to serve a two-way role as arguably the most significant mediator of literature between Russia and the West in his own time. And his activities as a translator constituted a very significant element in that mediation. Despite this, the general topic of Turgenev as a translator has still not attracted the attention it deserves.² Although most (but not all) of Turgenev's translations *into* Russian have now been republished in one or both of the Academy of Sciences editions of his collected works, almost none of his extensive translations *from* Russian, which include participation in several volumes of translations into French of Pushkin, Lermontov and Gogol' as well as numerous volumes of his own works, have been republished. Not only is the sheer quantity of material astonishing, but even compiling a comprehensive list remains a daunting task, given that his precise role is often subject to dispute. On at least one occasion, his name appeared as a translator when he did not do the translation; his acknowledged translations into French were normally published as joint translations, but sometimes his active participation went

¹ M. P. Alekseev, "Turgenev—propagandist russkoi literatury na zapade," in M. P. Alekseev, *Russkaia literatura i ee mirovoe znachenie* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1989) 268–307. First published in 1948.

² Although there have been studies of specific translations in which, and translators with whom, Turgenev collaborated, the broad topic of Turgenev as a translator remains largely ignored (a lament forcefully made already by Alekseev 273). A recent exception is A. S. Kliment'eva, "I. S. Turgenev—perevodchik," kand. diss., Tomsk, 2007.

unacknowledged; it would even appear that, occasionally, translations for which Turgenev was at least in part responsible were accredited in print to someone else. Yet even once this minefield is negotiated and even if his known translations were to be published or republished, we would still not have the complete picture, because a not insignificant number of his translations, including, for example, all his translations from Spanish, are lost.

Translations always represent a point of potential friction between the “self” and the “other” and attitudes towards translations generally reflect the state of the national cultural psyche, something that fluctuates over time and depends also on the value attached in the target culture to the culture from which the translation is being made. No one in Russia doubted the necessity and value of translations into Russian, but the situation among the more established (and insularly self-centred) cultures of Western Europe was dramatically different.³ Turgenev’s case is, therefore, particularly interesting precisely because of his unique position as an intermediary between several cultures and as an active translator, including as a translator of his own works.

Not surprisingly, in translation as in other areas, successive periods tend to reevaluate the procedures and principles adopted by the previous period. Russia has a long history of translation going back to earliest times and the early nineteenth century was particularly rich, most notably in the translations by Vasilii Zhukovskii. These achievements were then reexamined and challenged by the generation of the 1840s and in this, as in so much else, the leading figure was Vissarion Belinskii.⁴ At this stage in his life and career, of course, Turgenev was operating exclusively within the Russian cultural context. His engagement with translation “theory” in the early 1840s comes in the context of his critical articles devoted to specific translations, such as his 1843 review of Fedor Miller’s Russian translation of Schiller’s *Wilhelm Tell*:

Переводы можно вообще разделить на два разряда: на переводы, поставшие себе целью, как говорится, познакомить читателя с отличным или хорошим произведением иностранной литературы, и на переводы, в которых художник старается воссоздать великое произведение и, смотря по степени собственного

³ See, e.g., Turgenev’s comment in an 1857 letter to Lev Tolstoi: “Всё не ихнее им [французикам] кажется дико—и глупо. «Ah! le lecteur Français ne saurait admettre cela!»” I. S. Turgenev, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem*, 2nd ed., *Pis'ma*, vol. 3 (Moscow: Nauka, 1987) 181. The first edition appeared between 1960 and 1968 (Leningrad); the second edition (Moscow, 1978–) has not yet been completed. Future references will be in the form S. (Sochineniia) or P. (Pis'ma) with the edition identified by a superscript number, volume number and page number.

⁴ For a succinct account see Maurice Friedberg, *Literary Translation in Russia. A Cultural History* (University Park PA: The Pennsylvania University Press, 1997). For an account of the specific role of Belinskii, see Iu. D. Levin, “V. G. Belinskii—teoretik perevoda,” in his *Russkie perevodchiki XIX veka i razvitie khudozhestvennogo perevoda* (Leningrad, Nauka, 1985) 97–104.

творческого таланта, способности проникаться чужими мыслями и чувствами, более или менее приближается к разрешению своей трудной задачи. Дух (личность) переводчика веет в самом верном переводе, и этот дух должен быть достоин сочетаться с духом воссозданного поэта. От того-то хорошие переводы у нас (да и везде) чрезвычайно редки. (S².1.190)

His most extensive comments about the nature of translation are to be found in his 1844 review of Mikhail Vronchenko's translation of Goethe's *Faust*, in which he discusses the necessary talents of the translator at some length:

[Истинно хороших переводчиков] нельзя назвать самостоятельными талантами, но они одарены глубоко и верным пониманием красоты, уже выраженной другим, способностью поэтически воспроизводить впечатления, производимые на них любимым их поэтом; элемент восприимчивости преобладает в них, и собственный их творческий дар отзывается страдательностью, необходимостью опоры. [...] всякий хороший перевод проникнут любовью переводчика к своему образу, понятной, разумной любовью, то есть читатель чувствует, что между этими двумя натурами существует действительная, непосредственная связь... (S².1.227–228).

The desire to be an intermediary is not enough, admiration for a work or an artist is not enough, there has to be an affinity of spirit that is both emotional and aesthetic. At the same time, a translation has to function as a work of literature in its own right and in the culture of the language into which it has been translated:

Чем более перевод нам кажется не переводом, а непосредственным, самобытным произведением, тем он превосходнее; читатель не должен чувствовать ни малейшего следа той ассимиляции, того процесса, которому подвергся подлинник в душе переводчика; хороший перевод есть полное превращение, метаморфоза. [...] Люди, не знающие вовсе подлинника, но одаренные ухом и вкусом, лучшие судьи в этом деле; [...] (S².1.228–229).

If these comments largely echo those of his contemporaries, Turgenev's *practice* as regards translations into Russian is to be viewed as primarily a "private" matter; as often as not publication was not the specific intent.

Turgenev's activity as a translator to a great extent spans his entire career as a writer. As a student in St. Petersburg in 1837, sending his initial attempts at poetry to Aleksandr Nikitenko, one of his professors, he mentions that most of the previous year had been dedicated to translating Shakespeare (parts of *Othello* and *King Lear*) and Byron (*Manfred*). He had destroyed the Shakespeare translations and notes: "[...] это было ложное направление—я совершенно не гожусь в переводчики" (P².1.133). In 1844 Turgenev's translation of the last scene of Part 1 of Goethe's *Faust* appeared in the journal *Otechestvennye zapiski* and two years later two short translations, of Byron's "Darkness" and the twelfth of Goethe's "Römische Elegien," did appear in the Nekrasov-edited *Peterburgskii sbornik*, but their appearance in print can in all probability be

attributed to Turgenev's desire to help out Nekrasov with content for his collection.⁵ These "fragments" resemble the translations that occasionally occur in Turgenev's letters, such as the translation of "Clärchen's Lied" from Goethe's *Egmont* (in an 1840 letter to his friends Mikahil Bakunin and Aleksandr Efremov⁶), or that he, apparently, presented to friends or neighbours (such as a translation of Fortunio's Song from Alfred de Musset's play *Le Chandelier*).⁷ In other words, they are "occasional" pieces. It is clear that Turgenev primarily translated "for himself" and that the titles we know merely represent a quite possibly small part of the full total of his translations of this period. Given the fragmentary nature of the works translated and the fact that many had already appeared in Russian translation, one cannot speak of a proselytizing desire to make important works of European literature known to a Russian audience, even in a "new" translation. Nor can there be any suggestion—especially after his return from his studies in Germany—that Turgenev was somehow using translation to help himself better understand works he was reading. While the works themselves do represent major European authors, the decision to translate into Russian was largely inspired by the challenge of rendering in his own language a work, or part of a work, that in some way affected him particularly closely. Of the "Römische Elegien," the fruit of Goethe's famous sojourn in Italy (1786–1788) that Turgenev himself read in anticipation of his own trip there in 1840, he writes to Timofei Granovskii: "Какая жизнь, какая страсть, какое здоровье дышит в них! [...] Эти элегии пролились в мою кровь—как я жажду любви!" (P².1.144) This element of a personal interest continued to be significant. In 1872 Turgenev was so struck by the poetry of Walt Whitman, of which he said: "Ничего более поразительного себе представить нельзя," that he translated some of his poems, again without the express intention of publishing them.⁸ A curious exception to this pattern seems to be the translation into Russian of Charles Perrault's *Les contes des fées*. In 1862 Turgenev was approached to translate the Perrault collection into Russian, to be published by Vol'f with the famous illustrations by Gustave Doré. This exception may, however, be also the one that proves the rule. In this instance there was no direct personal connection with the work being translated and Turgenev's interest and

⁵ See S².1.22–29, 53–55, 56–57. To judge by Nekrasov's letter to Nikitenko of 3 January 1846, the two translations may have been a late addition (N. A. Nekrasov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem*, vol. 14, (St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1998) 57, 259.

⁶ See P².1.166–167 and S².1.313.

⁷ See S².1.323, 541.

⁸ P².12.50. Only a fragment of a draft translation of "Beat! beat! drums!" from the "Drum Taps" section of *Leaves of Grass* has been preserved (S².12.294–295. See I. Chistova, "Turgenev i Whitman," *Russkaia literatura* 1966, No. 2: 196–199.

commitment quickly waned; he soon abandoned the task and farmed out most of the translations, even while letting his name remain on the publication.⁹

The case of Turgenev's translations from Spanish shows a different kind of personal connection. Spanish was the *lingua franca* in Pauline Viardot's family and Turgenev began to study it in 1847, practicing his oral skills with Pauline's mother Joaquina and other members of her family. A significant component of his learning process consisted of reading the classics of Spanish literature.¹⁰ In his "Hamlet and Don Quixote" essay Turgenev lamented the absence of a good translation of Cervantes's *Don Quijote de la Mancha* and on three occasions, each time in the aftermath of disappointment with his own writing, he proposed to translate it himself.¹¹ Although nothing came of these intentions, this was not the only Spanish work which attracted his attention as a translator. In early 1866, facing a series of unfulfilled promises to various publishers, Turgenev proposes "payment" with translations of Cervantes's "Rinconete y Cortadillo" (to Stepan Dudyskhin) and of the anonymous 16th century picaresque prototype *Lazarillo de Tormes* (to Mikhail Katkov).¹² Turgenev refers to both these translations as complete, or almost complete (suggesting that he had undertaken them once again not with the intention of publishing), although it is possible that he was exaggerating his claims; despite the fact that both editors expressed some interest, neither was published or seems to have survived even in manuscript form.¹³ A particularly close friendship with the author could be no less important an incentive. At a time when he was most closely connected to Maria Markovich [Markovych], he translated a collection of her stories, followed by her novel *Instytutka*.¹⁴ And personal considerations were even more at the heart of Turgenev's translations of the texts for Pauline Viardot's various *Lieder*

⁹ The Volf edition did not appear until 1866. Turgenev translated two stories "Volshebniitsa" and "Siniia boroda" and provided the preface (with much delay and effort) in 1865 (see P².6.315, 291 and P².5.86–87, 448).

¹⁰ See, e.g., his letter to Pauline Viardot of 13 (25) December 1847 in which he discusses the Calderón plays that he has been reading (P².1.246).

¹¹ S².5.330. The first occasion on which Turgenev said he intended to translate *Don Quixote* came in 1853 following criticism of his first, unfinished, novel *Dva pokoleniia* (see P².2.243), the second in 1857, following his decision to destroy all his current manuscripts (see P².3.195–196) and the last following the initial failure of his last novel *Nov'* (see P¹.121, 101).

¹² P².7.17 and 21.

¹³ P².7.32 and 51. Alexandre Zviguilsky has suggested (without providing a source) that the "Rinconete y Cortadillo" translation was actually done by Nikolai Shcherban' (A. Zviguilsky, "Tourguénev et l'Espagne," *Revue de littérature comparée* 33.1 (1959): 79.

¹⁴ Marko Vovchok, *Ukrainskie narodnye rasskazy* (St. Petersburg: Kozhanchikov, 1859); "Instytutka," *Otechestvennye zapiski* 1 (1860).

albums.¹⁵ Indeed, it was for Viardot's musical activities that Turgenev was willing to undertake translations that he otherwise considered beyond his "competence," such as translations between French and German.¹⁶

The translations which are undoubtedly the best known of all Turgenev's translations combine personal with public factors in a unique way. In 1874 his efforts to have the play "La Tentation de St. Antoine" by his close friend Gustave Flaubert published in Russia failed when Mikhail Stasiulevich, the editor of *Vestnik Evropy* (in which Turgenev published his own works), became convinced that the work would not get through the Russian censorship.¹⁷ Consequently, two years later, Turgenev decided to play a more direct rôle in the publication of Flaubert's "La Légende de St Julien l'Hospitalier" and, later, also of "Hérodiade," the first and last of Flaubert's *Trois contes*. In March 1876 he wrote to Stasiulevich announcing his intention of translating "La Légende" himself (from Flaubert's manuscript before its publication in France) expressly for publication in *Vestnik Evropy*.¹⁸ Although Turgenev's efforts were certainly in part formed out of a desire to help Flaubert financially (he declined all payment in favour of the author¹⁹), he was genuinely impressed by these works and wanted to make them known in Russia. No less important, however, was the challenge that they presented to him—and to his native language. Indeed, this challenge produced an uncharacteristic note of pride when he wrote that translating "Hérodiade": "[...] представил такие трудности, что—без хвастовства скажу—не знаю, кто бы другой лучше меня это сделал [...]"²⁰

¹⁵ See S².12.298–304 and 643–651, where, however, some translations actually by Turgenev but not accredited to him in the published volumes, are omitted and some attributions (of texts accredited to him in print, but actually translations) are incorrect.

¹⁶ This included the translation of parts of their operetta *Le Dernier Sorcier* from the original French into German (see, e.g. the letter from Pauline Viardot to Turgenev of 18 February 1869, Ivan Tourguénev, *Lettres inédites à Pauline Viardot et sa famille* (Lausanne: L'Age d'homme, 1972) 326–327). In 1873 Pauline Viardot published a selection of 50 Lieder by Franz Schubert. The French translation was attributed to Louis Pomey, but Turgenev's letter to Pomey of 27 September 1865 (P².6.158) strongly suggests that Pomey polished translations actually done by Turgenev with Viardot, which in turn suggests the possibility that other albums for which Pomey is credited with the translation may have been prepared similarly.

¹⁷ See P².13.22 and 365.

¹⁸ See P₁.11.229 and P¹.12₁.83–84.

¹⁹ See P¹.12₁.106.

²⁰ P¹.12₁.128. The rough drafts of the translations, preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale, attest to his meticulous work. Analyzing the manuscript of "Irodiada," Petr Zaborov concludes: "В свой перевод он вложил замечательное ощущение воскрешенной Флобером эпохи, тончайшее чутье и мастерство стилиста, совершенное знание французского и редкостное владение родным языком, а также глубокое понимание потребностей читателя, которому предназначался—в его интерпретации—флюберовский шедевр." (P. R. Zaborov, "Iz tvorcheskoj laboratorii

Nor was his final verdict any different. On receiving the printed version of "La Légende" from Stasiulevich, he acknowledged the achievement:

Могу прибавить, что изо всей моей литературной карьеры я ни на что не гляжу с большей гордостью—как на этот перевод. Это был *tour de force*—заставить русский язык схватиться с французским—и не остаться побежденным. Что бы ни сказали читатели—я сам собой доволен и глазу себя по головке (P¹.12, 131).

In discussing Turgenev's translations from Russian, Alekseev goes so far as to state that Turgenev's activities as a proselytizing translator effectively created a "school of translators," particularly in France, but also in England.²¹ While acknowledging Turgenev's superior knowledge of the expectations of the reading public in several European countries (as a result of which not only did he consider some of his own works simply unsuitable for translation, but even permitted changes to be made in order to accommodate local expectations), Alekseev identified the distinctive feature of this "Turgenev school": "[...] буквальная близость к подлиннику для него важнее стилистических совершенств перевода, сохранение «духа» оригинала существеннее, чем приверженность к привычным нормам языка, на который делается перевод."²² In the light of this, one might be surprised by the frequency with which those who have compared translations done or supervised by Turgenev with the originals, point to a profusion of differences, errors and omissions that put in doubt the regular assertions about a close check against the original text.

Turgenev's translations from Russian present a far more complex picture than do his translations into his native language. The aspect of proselytizing here does play the primary rôle and it is indeed heavily shaped by Turgenev's solid understanding of the realities of publishing industry in Western Europe. One component of this reality was the fact that Russia was not a signatory to any international and few bilateral conventions concerning authors' rights, which meant that all too often a translation could be undertaken without permission, or without paying any honorarium. Consequently, Turgenev was affected not only as translator, but even more directly as author—and he was often grateful just for the courtesy when a translator or publisher approached him in advance. The extent of his involvement in the translations of his own works varied significantly. Sometimes he would learn of a translation only after publication, when someone (even a rival translator) brought it to his attention; sometimes he established contact with the translator directly, offering advice or checking a translation; and sometimes he would be involved from the very beginning, whether the translation project was proposed by him, or by someone else.

Turgeneva-perevodchika," *Turgenev i ego sovremenniki*, ed. M. P. Alekseev (Leningrad: Nauka, 1977) 135).

²¹ Alekseev 290.

²² Alekseev 292–293. See also Alekseev 271.

Generally, Turgenev took almost any opportunity to become involved, as a measure of exerting at least some control over the published translations of his own works. As his fame increased and as he established relationships with certain publishers and translators, the degree of his involvement also tended to increase. In addition, there is a direct relationship between the degree of Turgenev's involvement and his comfort with the target language. Thus, he was always most involved in the French translations, somewhat less with German ones. As for English translations, while always willing to provide help and clarification, he came to rely on particular individuals whom he came to trust, first and foremost William Ralston, and he played no part whatsoever in translations into other languages.²³ Finally, despite his excellent knowledge of French and German, Turgenev was always at pains to involve authors and writers from those countries, both to ensure as much as possible that the translation conform to a native stylistic standard, but also as a conduit into the national publishing world.

Turgenev was very conscious of the fact that throughout most of his writing career the reading public in most West European countries had little interest in translations from contemporary "foreign" literatures, and that as a result publishers were reluctant to expend too much interest or capital on translation ventures. To Mikhail Avdeev, who had requested advice as to where to publish French translations of two of his novels, he wrote in 1868:

Переводы с иностранных языков печатаются в Париже туго и неохотно, потому что плохо идут с рук. Диккенс не нам чета—а ни один из его романов не вышел вторым изданием [...] Мои книги переводились—но собственно я ни копейки за это не получал никогда,—а переводчику—в виде великой милости—платилось, и то не всегда, франков 300, 400. Афера, как Вы видите, не блестящая.²⁴

In fact, on occasion, Turgenev actually effectively commissioned a translation himself. When in 1862 the well-known translator Friedrich Bodenstedt sent him a translation of his story "Faust," Turgenev saw this as a singular opportunity to make his work better known in Germany:

²³ See, e.g., his letter of 24 February 1877 to Pavel Annenkov: "Только и было у меня занятий, что корректур немецкого и французского перевода «Нови» (есть и английский, и италиянский, и даже шведский (!)—но этих, к счастью, мне не посылают [...])" (P¹.13,95).

²⁴ P².8.191–192. That same year, in recommending a translation of Aleksei Tolstoi's *Kniaz' serebriannyi* to his own French publisher and friend, Jules Hetzel, he notes: "Je crois que cela peut avoir du succès—ce succès de 2000 lecteurs, dont vous me parliez et que ne dépassent guère les ouvrages traduits" (P².8.189). When there was an honorarium Turgenev would frequently relinquish it in favour of the translator (see e.g. his letter of 23 December 1868 to Julius Rodenberg, P².9.105).

Je viens de la lire [la traduction] et je suis resté ravi à la lettre—elle est tout simplement parfaite. [...] Cette bonne fortune m'a fait venir l'eau à la bouche—et voici ce que je me permets de vous proposer. Je serais très heureux de me faire connaître au public allemand par l'entremise d'un introducteur aussi excellent et aussi populaire que vous l'êtes—et si vous vouliez faire un choix de mes nouvelles pour les publier, je serais enchanté de tenir à votre disposition la somme que vous jugeriez suffisante pour vos honoraires—car je sais bien que les éditeurs actuels ne sont guère disposés pour tout ce qui est russe et ne se chargeraient tout au plus que de la publication.²⁵

In his review of William Ralston's translation of the fables of Krylov, who "was as Russian as possible," Turgenev praises it precisely on the grounds of Ralston's success in acclimatizing the translation to its target culture: "Mr. Ralston's translation leaves nothing to desire in the matter of accuracy or colouring [...] It will not prove his fault if Krilof does not prove to be thoroughly «naturalised» in England" (S².10.268; 267). In face of the contradictory requirements of confrontation and hybridization, for Turgenev the translation had simultaneously to be acclimatized while remaining true to the "spirit" of the original. Once a work had been chosen for translation, the primary qualities that Turgenev required of an excellent translator were not only a literary sensibility in the target language, but also the ability to render the specific aesthetic of the author being translated. The ultimate accolade, as expressed in his reaction to Bodenstedt's translations of Shakespeare's sonnets and echoing his comments in the review of the Vronchenko translation of *Faust*, continued to be: "Toute espèce d'impression de traduction disparaît complètement : vos vers coulent de source avec une facilité merveilleuse—et ce n'est que plus tard qu'on réfléchit avec étonnement au tour de force accompli" (P².5.19). For Turgenev, the greatest sin of any translation was that it was "dry" or "wooden," that it lacked "life," a fault for which no faithfulness to the original could compensate. Laments to this effect, concerning translations not only of his own works, abound. He describes Eugene Schuyler's translation of Tolstoy's "Kazaki" as "верен—но сух и «matter of fact», как сам г-н Скайлер [...]" (P¹.12,383). An English translation of *Eugene Onegin* is "верности невероятной, изумительной—и такой же изумительной глубинности" (P¹.13,149). A "hölzerne" German translation of "Istoriia leitnanta Ergunova" that he had been sent is "getreu—aber um es offen herauszusagen—etwas schwerfällig und leblos—zu sehr in Geschäftsstyl" (P².9.115; 121). An

²⁵ P².5.121. Bodenstedt admitted that he had trouble convincing publishers to take his first translations from Turgenev, and even his proposed 3 volume edition of Turgenev's stories stopped after the first two volumes because of small sales (see Henri Granjard (Granzhar), "Pis'ma Friedricha Bodenstedta (1861–1868)," in *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, vol. 73, kn. 2 (Moscow: Nauka, 1964) 307, and H. Rappich, "Turgenev i Bodenstedt," *Lit. nasl.* 73₂, 337).

interesting case is provided by Henri Hippolyte Delaveau. As a result of Turgenev's publicly expressed dissatisfaction with Ernest Charrière's translation of the *Zapiski okhotnika*, Delaveau approached Turgenev about an "authorized" translation. Despite Turgenev's direct involvement in working on Delaveau's translation, the results did not prove satisfactory to the author; he found the translation to have a "caractère morne et «procès-verbal»" (P².10.117), a factor of Delaveau's "insuffisance littéraire" (P².3.280). Thus, within certain parameters, an exact rendering of the original and even a knowledge of the original were actually secondary. Among the translators in whom Turgenev had most faith was Moritz Hartmann²⁶ and, not surprisingly, Turgenev recommended Hartmann to Erich Behre, when Behre began to undertake a German edition of his works. However, when Behre wanted Hartmann to provide the translation of the story "Neshchastnaia," Turgenev wrote: "Hartmann kann meine neueste Novelle nicht *direct* übersetzen, da er des Russischen nicht mächtig ist, er übersetzt erst aus dem Französischen.—Wenn Sie aber auf das «Tagebuch eines Jägers»—reflectiren, so bin Ich überzeugt—er würde eine vortreffliche Version liefern—da er dieses Werk aus den Französischen Uebersetzung gründlich kennt, [...]" (P².9.85). When the German translation of *Ottsy i deti* that Turgenev himself had recommended to Behre proved inadequate, he turned to Ludwig Pietsch for assistance in "correcting" it, arguing that "es handelt sich nur darum, einen Vergleich mit der französischen (vortrefflichen) Uebersetzung durchzuführen [...]" (P².9.123).

The contradiction between "foreign" and the "domestic" requirements was exacerbated by the widespread belief (perhaps particularly in France, where the concept of free translations had a long—and "rich"—tradition²⁷), that there were limits to what the receiving culture—or more precisely its readers—were prepared to tolerate and this needed to be taken into consideration. Turgenev's sensitivity to the difficulties facing translations went so far as the belief that some works, including some of his own, were simply not suitable for translation. He was not particularly surprised, for example, when, the French journal *Revue des deux mondes* refused to publish, on the grounds that it was absurd nonsense ("тиль несуразная"), a translation of "Prizraki," even though it had previously published a number of his works and this translation had been done by Prosper Mérimée.²⁸ Consequently, when it came to his own works, he frequently left the

²⁶ See, e.g., his letters to Hartmann of 7 January and 2 February 1868 (P².8.90 and 105).

²⁷ "At a time when, in Germany, fidelity is being celebrated with almost marital overtones by Breitingger, Voss, and Herder, France translates without the least concern for fidelity and continues its never-abandoned tradition of 'embellishing' and 'poeticizing' translations." (Antoine Berman. *The Experience of the Foreign. Culture and Translation in Romantic Germany*, Translated by S. Heyvaert. SUNY Series, Intersections (Albany: SUNY Press, 1992) 35.

²⁸ See P².6.164; the story did eventually appear, when Mérimée threatened to cut his ties with the journal unless they published the story! (See Prosper Mérimée, *Correspondance*

choice of works to be translated or included in a collection of translations, to the translator or publisher, because they knew the intended audience best.²⁹ His deference to the issue of national norms (as well as to the prerogatives of the translator) was such that he was willing to accept that a translator could omit sentences or even sections that might be considered to contravene those norms, or even change a text in order to accommodate them. Indeed, Turgenev actually went further; cuts could even be a matter of æsthetic judgement on the part of the translator! Alekseev highlights an extreme case in which, according to Nataliia Ostrovskaiia, Turgenev actually proposed undertaking a French translation of Tolstoi's *Voina i mir* in which all the philosophizing would be cut or relegated to an appendix!³⁰ The best known, and most extreme case, of changes "authorized" by Turgenev in one of his own works to accommodate the sensibilities of a national audience occurred with the story "Pervaia liubov'" and involves an addition. In 1860 the editors of the *Revue des deux mondes* had refused to publish the story, on moral grounds that were shared by Turgenev's friend and collaborator, Louis Viardot.³¹ When the story finally appeared in the collection *Nouvelles scènes de la vie russe* published by Dentu in 1863, it came with a framing coda in which the listeners to the story consider the events described as a reflection of specifically Russian *mores*. In a letter to Ludwig Pietsch of 15 February 1882, Turgenev states

[...] das ganze reflectirende Anhängsel am Ende der Novelle «Die erste Liebe» ist von meinem französischen Uebersetzer (unter uns: von Viardot) aus *moralischen* Rücksichten zugefügt worden ... [...] Wie wenig so etwas in meiner Natur liegt—werden Sie wohl wissen...³²

Générale, 2^e série, tome 7 [Toulouse: Édouard Privat, 1959] 127).

²⁹ See e.g. his letters to Bodenstedt of 6 and 16 November 1862 (P².5.125 and 130).

³⁰ The reason given was that French readers would find such passages boring and ridiculous (an opinion more attributable to Turgenev himself). See N. A. Ostrovskaiia, "Iz vospominanii ob I. S. Turgeneve," *Turgenev v vospominaniiakh sovremennikov*, vol. 2 (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1983) 78; Alekseev 301–302. Not surprisingly, Tolstoi rejected this suggestion.

³¹ See the strongly worded letter from Louis Viardot to Turgenev of 23 November 1860, Ivan Tourguénev, *Nouvelle correspondance inédite*, tome II (Paris: Librairie des Cinq Continents, 1972) 115–116.

³² P¹.13.196. The existence in the Bibliothèque Nationale of a Russian version of this addendum, entitled "Прибавленный хвост для французского издания в Первой любви," has led some Russian commentators to suggest that Turgenev was here protesting too much and that, under pressure from his "co-translator," he acquiesced and wrote the coda himself (see E. I. Kiiko, "Okonchanie povesti «Pervaia liubov'» (1863)," *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, t. 73, kn. 1, 59–68, where the relevant documents are reproduced in facsimile). The formulation used for this title, however, does not exclude the possibility of the translation of a French text *into* Russian. Regardless of the degree of

At the same time, Turgenev on occasion took advantage of his involvement with the translations of his works to include passages that had been excised by the Russian censors, for example in Delaveau's translation of the *Zapiski okhotnika*,³³ or, the biography of Valerian Ratmirov, in the translation of *Dym*.³⁴ Indeed, for Turgenev, the translation process could serve as a continuation of the creative process and he sometimes made additions to the text of the translation that were subsequently introduced into the Russian text. In his letter to Louis Viardot of 16 October 1857, he *suggests* an addition ("je vous propose d'ajouter") to the end of the translation of "Poezdka v Poles'e." This text, with some stylistic modifications (presumably made by Viardot) appeared when the translation was published the following year and was then added (with some minor additional modifications) to the next Russian edition.³⁵

Two constants in Turgenev's rôle in translations were his insistent pleas that he be sent the proofs, in particular of translations with which he had previously not been involved directly, and also his reliance on "native authorities," even for languages that he knew well. He made correcting proofs a formal requirement of his agreement with Behre for the "authorized" German edition of his collected works.³⁶ However, the nature of the changes Turgenev made in the proofs conformed to his basic understanding of the independent rôle of the translator. When Bodenstedt sent Turgenev his translation of "Prizraki" for checking, Turgenev insisted: "meine Verbesserungen gingen bloss auf den Sinn—nie auf die Form und lassen Ihnen Ihre Freiheit ganz" (P².6.54). If one remembers Turgenev's horror at even minor misprints in his works, it comes as no surprise that he objected most strenuously to the nonsense that not infrequently crept into translations as a result of an inadequate knowledge of the original language. Consequently, he was always willing to assist translators, encouraging them in his letters to write for help and highlighting any errors in order to avoid basic mistranslation.³⁷ The demand for proofs was thus to examine the work *after* the

Turgenev's complicity, the designation given this coda acknowledges the significance of national sensibilities.

³³ See F. Ia. Priima, "Novye dannye o «Zapiskakh okotnika» Turgeneva vo frantsuzskoi literature," in «Zapiski okhotnika» I. S. Turgeneva (1852–1952). *Sbornik statei i materialov* (Orel: Orlovskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 1955) 344–345.

³⁴ See R. M. Gorokhova, "«Dym». Rabota Turgeneva nad frantsuzskim perevodom romana," in *Turgenevskii sbornik. Materialy k Polnomu sobraniuu sochinenii*, vol. V (Leningrad: Nauka, 1969) 255.

³⁵ P².3.262 and 563; see also I. Tourguéneff, "Deux journées dans les Grand-Bois," [*Nouvelles*] *Scènes de la vie russe* (1858; Paris: Hachette, 1887) 290–291 and S¹.7.70 and 302. The principal additional change in the Russian text is the phrase "и поигрывал и перебирал вожжами" in the first paragraph of the added text, referring to Kondrat.

³⁶ See his letter to Behre of 19 November 1868 (P².9.84).

³⁷ See, e.g., his letter to Bodenstedt of 12 July 1864 (P².6.39); Bodenstedt attached a list of expressions with which he had difficulty to his reply of 29 July (see Granjard, 325).

translator had completed his work in order to eliminate nonsense (outright mistranslations and misunderstandings). In addition, despite his tolerance of the *excisions* made by a translator to accommodate the expectations of the receiving culture, Turgenev generally objected to unauthorized additions and interpolations, including “authorial” commentary where he had had none.³⁸ Having made his corrections, Turgenev then required that they undergo a final stylistic check, clearly part of the efforts to ensure that the translation read “natively” in the target language. While one might assume that there was a certain element of aesthetic judgment involved in the choice of those who were asked to make that final check (that Turgenev chose writers whose style he appreciated), the degree to which he was willing to give them “*carte blanche*” is perhaps unexpected. An extreme, if humorously hyperbolic, case is provided by the German translation of *Ottsy i deti* that he had asked Pietsch to “correct” on the basis of the French translation:

Was die Uebersetzung betrifft—haben Sie natürlich die vollständigste *carte blanche*! Sie können, wenn Sie wollen—Bazaroff die Frau Odintsoff heirathen lassen; protestiren werd’ ich nicht! Im Gegentheil” (P².9.135).

Given that the French translations of Turgenev’s works so often served as the base text for additional translations, it is not surprising that Turgenev devoted so much effort to monitoring, assisting and even undertaking these himself, but always, at least nominally, in conjunction with others. His first forays into translation into French date back to the 1840s when he assisted Louis Viardot (apparently on the latter’s initiative) with Viardot’s translations from Gogol’, by dictating French translations of the originals (since Viardot did not know Russian).³⁹ The Gogol’ translations became the first part of a comprehensive programme of translations from Russian literature undertaken by Viardot and Turgenev, which included works by Pushkin and Lermontov, as well as, later, Turgenev’s own works.⁴⁰ This practice of Turgenev’s dictating and an “authority”—for whom French was his native literary language and who

See also the letter to Maria Pezold of 14 December 1869 (P².10.94). This willingness to help translators extended beyond his own works (see, e.g., the letter of 10 August 1879 to Emile Durand, P¹.12.111).

³⁸ So-called “отсебятина” (see, e.g., the discussion of the translation practice of Irinarkh Vvedenskii in Friedberg 44–48, and Levin 128–131).

³⁹ In the preface to the first collection Viardot indicates that several Russians (including Turgenev) aided him. Turgenev quickly became Viardot’s sole collaborator in these translations, even if it was not until he became known in France in his own right that his contribution was acknowledged in the publications themselves (see Michel Cadot, “Le rôle d’I. S. Tourguéniev et de Louis Viardot dans la diffusion de la littérature russe en France,” *Cahiers Tourguéniev – Pauline Viardot – Maria Malibran* 5 (1981): 53.

⁴⁰ A comprehensive list is provided in Cadot 54.

had experience in the French publishing world—revising the dictated text, remained for most of his career the basis of Turgenev's practice for those translations into French with which he was involved as the initial translator. Turgenev's facility in instantaneous oral translation is widely attested to—and not only from Russian into French.⁴¹ Nor did Louis Viardot ever make a secret of their method, writing to Hetzel in 1859: "J'ai eu soin d'annoncer, à deux reprises, comment mes traductions du russe étaient faites : un ami me dicte le mot à mot, et j'écris le français, voilà tout."⁴² Emile and Alice Durand, who were responsible for many of the translations of Turgenev's later works, provide additional details: "Il dictait une traduction aussi littérale que possible de son œuvre à M. Viardot, qui la mettait en français littéraire sous sa direction. Chaque phrase difficile, chaque mot douteux était discuté entre eux, et le résultat finissait par être excellent."⁴³ A fascinating insight into the working of Turgenev's polyglot brain during this process is provided by a manuscript preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. It is a translation of "Malinovaia voda" and the title page reads "Traduction dictée par Tourgueneff."⁴⁴ It is a rough copy (with numerous subsequent changes and corrections, at least some in Turgenev's hand), in which, in a few places, we find an untranslated Russian word or phrase, such as "Oh ces maitresses, Bon Seigneur, voilà онъ-то его и разорили." The Russian phrase is subsequently translated in the left margin: "C'est elles qui l'ont ruiné."⁴⁵ The untranslated phrases are not in any respect difficult and their presence indicates that, where a particular word or phrase does not immediately pop into mind, rather than stop to retrieve the appropriate word(s), he finds it preferable to continue and return later to deal with the recalcitrant text (while also making other changes, including stylistic ones).

Both contemporary and modern commentators attest to Turgenev's superior command of French. Although he undoubtedly counted on them for stylistic editing, his collaboration with widely-published intellectuals like Louis Viardot also provided access to the French publishing world that would simply ignore an unknown foreigner. Interestingly, the first initiative to translate Turgenev's

⁴¹ Guy de Maupassant recalls Turgenev's "crusade" of acquainting his French colleagues with the works of Goethe, Pushkin and Swinburne by translating "on-the-fly" during the Sunday afternoons at Flaubert's (Guy de Maupassant, "Étude sur Gustave Flaubert (1884)," *Œuvres Complètes de Guy de Maupassant*, présentés par Gilbert Sigaux, vol. 16 (Lausanne: Editions Rencontre, 1962) 486).

⁴² A. Parménie et C. Bonnier, *Histoire d'un éditeur et de ses auteurs : P.-J. Hetzel* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1953) 397, as quoted in Cadot 56.

⁴³ E. Durand-Gréville, "Ivan Tourguénef: Seconde et dernière partie," *Bibliothèque universelle et Revue suisse*, 3^e série, 48 (Décembre 1890): 579.

⁴⁴ BN, Slaves 78, f° 106r. The text itself follows: BN, Slaves 78, f^{os} 107–117.

⁴⁵ BN, Slaves 78, f° 115r. "Ох, уж эти матрески, прости Господи! Оне-то и его разорили" (S².3.37).

works into French almost certainly came from Viardot who proposed translating stories from *Zapiski okhotnika* as early as 1848, an offer that Turgenev declined at the time.⁴⁶ Turgenev's translations with Louis Viardot continued throughout most of his career, but during the 1860s an alternative authority appeared for Turgenev, Prosper Mérimée. Indeed, in some respects Mérimée served as a "higher" authority, a transition that did not occur without some friction.⁴⁷ Certainly Mérimée did have some advantages over Louis Viardot. His literary profile was greater, his long-standing interest in Russian history and literature (above all for Pushkin) inspired him to learn Russian to the point that he could—and did—undertake actual translations himself. Nonetheless, his main contribution to Turgenev was as editor of translations done by others and as the author of prefaces and articles on Turgenev's works that were certainly important in helping to consolidate Turgenev's reputation among educated French readers. Finally, he also served as a guide for what could be considered acceptable to French "morals," sometimes making changes in the translations, sometimes providing support and encouragement, as when editors demanded excisions he considered excessively puritan,⁴⁸ sometimes suggesting a third party adjudicator.⁴⁹ Turgenev repaid these services by acting as a consultant whenever Mérimée encountered difficulties in his Russian reading.⁵⁰ A letter to

⁴⁶ See the letter to Pauline Viardot of 11 January 1848 (P².1.251). Later the initiative to translate a particular work could come from either of the two men (see, e.g., the letter to Pauline Viardot of 13 February 1859, P².4.15). Their first published joint translation of a Turgenev work was of "Postoiayli dvor" (L'auberge de grand chemin), which appeared in feuilleton in the weekly *L'Illustration* XXX.770–774 (28 November–26 December 1857) (see Patrick Waddington with Florence Montreynaud, *A Bibliography of French Translations from the Works of I. S. Turgenev, 1854–1885* (Wellington, NZ: 1980) n. pag. (rpt. from *Slavonic and East European Review* LVIII.1 (1980): 76–98), item 7.

⁴⁷ See Louis Viardot's mild protest at having his name omitted from a translation in which he had been involved (Alexandre Zviguilsky, "A propos d'une traduction française de « Mtsyri » (Tourguéniev et Lermontov)," *Cah TVM* 15 (1991): 15–21).

⁴⁸ When problems arose with Buloz, the publisher of *Revue des deux mondes*, who insisted on changes in the translation of *Ottsy i deti* that Turgenev resisted in making, Mérimée backed his confrère, although this did not prevent him from subsequently making "quelques petits changements dans l'intérêt des mœurs" in that self-same work (see the letters to Turgenev of 24 February and 18 March 1863, Mérimée, 2^e série, t. 5, 342 and 361. See also 302). The translation was published as a separate volume in May by Charpentier (see Waddington / Montreynaud, item 28).

⁴⁹ See Mérimée's letter to Valentine Delessert of 22 December 1861 (Mérimée, 2^e série, t. 4, 434) and Turgenev's to the same correspondent of 25 December 1861 (P².4.391), concerning the suitability of the story "Zhid." The story was not published until 1869.

⁵⁰ See Maurice Parturier, *Une amitié littéraire : Prosper Mérimée et Ivan Tourguéniev* (Paris : Hachette, 1952), in which most of the extant Mérimée letters to Turgenev were first published. See also Thierry Ozwald, "Autour d'une collaboration littéraire : les destins croisés de Mérimée et Tourguéniev" *Cah TVM* 15 (1991): 79–101 and "Mérimée /

the publisher Jules Hetzel of 11 June 1868 about the translation of “Brigadir” serves to illustrate the reliance that Turgenev placed on Mérimée as a stylistic editor (as well as his relationship with a trusted publisher), even when Turgenev had been involved in the translation, in collaboration with Louis Viardot: “J’ai envoyé l’original russe à Mérimée; faites-lui parvenir une épreuve pour qu’il y jette un coup d’œil : de votre côté faites les corrections que vous jugeriez nécessaires.—J’ai dicté cette traduction à Viardot qui l’a mise en français: je suis sûr que c’est très exact—et Viardot sait son métier.”⁵¹ Mérimée was most closely involved with the 1869 collection, *Nouvelles Moscovites*, published by Hetzel, and it eventually appeared with four of the translations attributed to Mérimée and three to “l’auteur.”⁵² The details are, however, quite telling, for if Turgenev had almost blind faith in Mérimée as a stylistic authority correcting the translations of others, he was far less happy with his work as a translator. He decided not to use a translation of “Asia” that had been done by someone called Pagonkin and that Mérimée had carefully revised with the translator and declared “bien traduit,” preferring instead a translation he himself prepared, even though this demanded more than one set of proofs.⁵³ He wavered about substituting Shcherban’s version of “Sobaka” for the one done by Mérimée,⁵⁴ and he made so many changes in the proofs of Mérimée’s previously published translation of “Prizraki” that he not only demanded a second set of proofs, but realized that Mérimée would need to be informed, given the extent of the changes.⁵⁵

After Mérimée’s death in 1870, Turgenev returned to his collaboration with Louis Viardot (although he did occasionally turn to Gustave Flaubert⁵⁶), but

Tourguéniev : nouvelles-frontières,” *CahTVM* 27 (2003): 83–96.

⁵¹ P².8.206. Interestingly, this faith was not in the least undermined by the fact that Mérimée’s aesthetic tastes were not in harmony with Turgenev’s prose style, a divergence that Mérimée made no attempt to hide: “[...] moi, qui vous ai souvent reproché l’excès de vos adjectifs et le trop d’idées et d’images dans une seule phrase” (letter to Turgenev of 20 July 1867, Mérimée, 2^e série, t. 7, 555).

⁵² See Waddington / Montreynaud, item 38. See also P².9.207. For a detailed account, see R. M. Gorokhova, “K istorii izdaniia sbornika Turgeneva «Nouvelles moscovites»” *Turg. sb. Materialy*, vol. 1, 257–269.

⁵³ See Mérimée’s letter to Turgenev of 6 June 1866 (Mérimée, 2^e série, t. 7, 126) and Turgenev’s letters to Maréchal of 7, 16 and 20 March 1869 (P².9.162, 173 and 176–177).

⁵⁴ Letter to Hetzel of 13 April 1869 (P².9.193). In the end it was the publishers who made the decision for the Mérimée translation (see P².9.195 and 197.)

⁵⁵ Letter to Maréchal of 15 May 1869 (P².9.210).

⁵⁶ In 1876 he published a translation of four Pushkin poems that were “checked” by Gustave Flaubert (see André Meynieux, *Trois stylistes, traducteurs de Pouchkine—Mérimée, Tourguénev, Flaubert. Essai de traduction comparée* (Paris: Cahiers d’études littéraires, 1962)). In addition to these Pushkin translations, Flaubert also checked “Monsieur François,” Turgenev’s translation of “Chelovek v serykh ochkakh” (see P¹.12.123 and 168).

most of the late French translations were done by Emile Durand (some with his wife Alice, who used the pseudonym of Henri Gréville; the translations then appeared under the name "E. Durand-Gréville"). In "Durand-Gréville"'s own words, these were done "sous la direction de Tourguénef"⁵⁷; Turgenev was then once again sent proofs for his suggestions and corrections.⁵⁸ Only in his final years did Turgenev no longer feel the need for a formal authority in his own French translations. He and Pauline Viardot translated "Pesn' torzhestvuiushchei liubvi" (although no translator was designated when it appeared in *La Nouvelle Revue française* in November 1881), while the 30 poems in prose published in *La Revue politique et littéraire* in December 1882 were attributed to Turgenev alone, even though they also appear to have been done through his long-established practice of dictating his translation, in this instance to Pauline Viardot.⁵⁹ Pauline no doubt also offered advice and suggestions, but she could not play the rôle of public authority that her husband had played at the beginning of Turgenev's career, or Mérimée in its middle.

The question of Turgenev's checking a translation against the original text has long been a source of contention, for the evidence is contradictory at best. As might be expected, when it was a translation of a work other than his own, checking against the printed original played a part,⁶⁰ but in the case of his own works, it would appear that Turgenev was less than assiduous in checking the accuracy of the translated text. Presumably, when he began the translation process by dictating a translation, he did so from the original, but there is little evidence to suggest that he then rechecked the translation against the original at a later stage. One might expect that when he received a translation that had been done by someone else, he would check it against the original, but even here it

⁵⁷ Durand-Gréville, 579.

⁵⁸ Turgenev's letter to Durand of 22 March 1877 indicates that not only he, but Louis Viardot also read the proofs of the translation of *Nov'* (in which Viardot added an explanatory footnote) (P¹.121.119-120).

⁵⁹ See P¹.131.126 and P¹.132.129 and Waddington / Montreynaud, items 63, 65. The surviving manuscripts of these translations in the Bibliothèque Nationale (BN Slaves 77, f^{os} 85-191) are not in his hand. In the letter to Pietsch of 25 December 1882 Turgenev states that the poems in prose were translated "mit Hilfe Frau Viardot's" (P¹.132.129), whereas in a letter a few days later to William Ralston he writes that "the translation made in French by M-me Viardot was made according to her will, not mine." (P¹.132.133). Whereas Pietsch was an intimate of both Turgenev and Viardot, Ralston was Turgenev's professional colleague and perhaps even at this late date Turgenev still thought that his own authority might not carry sufficient weight.

⁶⁰ Afanasii Foeth recalls Turgenev doing a line by line check of his translations from Horace in 1853 (Afanasii Fet, *Moi vospominaniia* (1890; Facsimile reprint Moscow, 1992) 36). See also Turgenev's letter to Stasiulevich of 5 May 1873 recommending Vladimir Mikhailov's translation of Heinrich Heine's "Deutschland. Ein Wintermärchen," in which he says he checked every line (P².12.135).

would appear that this was far from a regular occurrence. The number of occasions when he subsequently becomes aware of serious flaws and errors in translations that he had previously praised, or even corrected, indicates that he was not always careful in reading the translations made by others. From a letter to Behre concerning *Ottsy i deti*, it emerges that it was the publisher who drew his attention to serious omissions in the translation that Turgenev himself had recommended.⁶¹ Memoirs indicate that it was not uncommon for Turgenev to read translations together with someone else. Shcherban' remembers how he and Vasilii Botkin occasionally took an even more active part in the Delaveau translation of *Zapiski okhotnika*:

Тургенев был, разумеется, доволен, что произведения его попали в руки человека, который не примет (как перед тем Шарриер) «арапник» за «арапа»; но слегка тяготился просмотром его рукописей и сличение их с оригиналом подчас доверял Боткину или мне,—быть может, не столько «из лени», сколько из опасения слишком усердным личным участием в переводе как бы изменить чете Виардо.⁶²

Turgenev's reluctance to check translations against his original, however, would appear to have been more fundamental than Shcherban' implies. A number of scholars who have compared a translation claimed to have been checked by Turgenev against the original have been surprised by the discrepancies, even when there seems to be strong evidence for such a check. Horst Rappich quotes Ludwig Pietsch remembering the checking of the Bodenstedt translation of "Prizraki," involving Pietsch himself reading the translation, Turgenev with a copy of the original in his hands, and Pauline Viardot. And yet, when Rappich himself compares the translation with the original, he also is forced to conclude: "[...] Тургенев, по-видимому, лишь бегло сравнивал перевод с русским текстом, обращая внимание на устранение грубых смысловых ошибок."⁶³ Once obvious mistranslations that made nonsense of the text had been eliminated, Turgenev's views about translator privileges and his primary consideration that the final translation should read well as an independent work rather than in relationship to its original, would seem to have determined his considerations and attitude.

A comparison of four French translations of the conclusion of the story "Biriuk" from the *Zapiski okhotnika* (see texts in Appendix A) provides an interesting insight into Turgenev's own practice as a translator. Turgenev's

⁶¹ Letter of 19 November 1868: "[...] nun Sie mir aber sagen, dass gegen das Ende einiges ausgelassen worden ist [...]" (P².9.84). Later (letter of 14 January 1869), he admitted that he had originally "blos[s] flüchtig angesehen" the text (P².9.120).

⁶² N. V. Shcherban', "Iz vospominanii ob I. S. Turgeneye (1861–1875)," *Turg. v vosp. sovr.*, vol. 2: 32.

⁶³ Rappich, 341–342. See also Cadot 54–55 and Nicholas G. Žekulin, "Two unpublished letters of Ivan Turgenev," *Slavonic and East European Review* 53 (Oct. 1975): 561.

translation is a fragment, now in the collection of the Musée Tourguéniev in Bougival, the only extant remnant of a translation presented to the Viardots' friend, Dr. Frisson;⁶⁴ the second example is from an 1875 translation by Charles Rollinat which Turgenev declared to be "très bonne" (P².13.52), the third is the "authorized" Delaveau translation on which Turgenev collaborated; the last is the notorious Charrière translation against which Turgenev had publicly protested, in great part because of "les changements, les interpolations, les additions qui s'y rencontrent à chaque page. C'est à ne pas s'y reconnaître" (P².2.293). In general the other translators live up to their reputations. Delaveau's translation is arguably the most exact, but does indeed read like a court clerk's account of events. Charrière adds his own editorializing ("tu m'as étonné *et réjoui*") and additional details such as reintroducing the forester's two children, absent from the original at the end of the story, and features such as the noise of the departing horse and the clanging gate. Rollinat combines accuracy with some degree of the verve missing from Delaveau—e.g. his "mais prends garde..." It is the Turgenev translation that might seem the most surprising. While there are a number of felicitous turns of phrase (Turgenev's "lança" compared to "poussa"), it is clear that Turgenev took greater liberties with the text than any of the others, even Charrière. These include additions (e.g. "du *malheureux* paysan"; "après s'être recueilli"; "avec un demi-sourire"), omissions (there is no mention of the narrator's arm movement in defense of the peasant), paraphrases and extensions (the ellipsis as the forester releases the peasant becomes verbalized: "Il n'acheva pas sa phrase"; the direct speech "удивил ты меня" becomes part of the narrative: "quand je fus revenu de mon étonnement"). There are even two outright mistranslations ("Через полчаса" becomes "Un *quart* d'heure plus tard"; more significantly "дождика-то вам не переждать" becomes its opposite "La pluie a cessé"). Yet this translation in many ways does conform to Turgenev's espoused views on translation in which woodenness is to be avoided at all costs and the "spirit" of the original is paramount, outweighing literal accuracy. Turgenev is certainly successful in rendering the charged atmosphere of the original, with its potential for violence between the three protagonists, before the almost instantaneous dissipation of tension as a result of Foma's startling and uncharacteristic action, effectively rendered, as in the original, by a series of five action verbs. At the same time it is hard to believe that there could have been any rechecking of this translation to ensure adherence to the original (although it also seems improbable that even Turgenev could have achieved this text by relying entirely and solely on his memory without any recourse to the original at some stage). In this text we can see how, for Turgenev, translation represented a continuation of the creative

⁶⁴ Published (facsimile and transcription) in *СЛТМ* 26 (2002): 215–216.

process, the artistic integrity of the new text outweighing the “authority” of an ostensibly established text.⁶⁵

APPENDIX A

Записки охотника
S². 3.162

Бирюк схватил его за плечо... Я бросился на помощь мужику...—Не троньте, барин!—крикнул на меня лесник.

Я бы не побоялся его угрозы и уже протянул было руку; но, к крайнему моему изумлению, он одним поворотом сдернул с локтей мужика кушак, схватил его за шиворот, нахлобучил ему шапку на глаза, растворил дверь и вытолкнул его вон.—Убирайся к черту с своей лошастью!—закричал он ему вслед, —да смотри, в другой раз у меня...

Он вернулся в избу и стал копать в углу.

Ну, Бирюк,—промолвил я наконец,—удивил ты меня: ты, я вижу, славный малый.

Turgenev
MS Musée Tourguéniev

Biruk se précipita sur lui et le saisit par l'épaule. Je m'élançai au secours du malheureux paysan... « Restez où vous êtes, Monsieur », s'écria le garde.—Je n'aurais pas reculé devant sa menace...

mais à mon grand étonnement, Biruk, après s'être recueilli pendant un instant, arracha d'un seul tour de main la ceinture avec laquelle il avait lié le prisonnier, le saisit par le collet, lui enfonça son bonnet jusqu'aux yeux, ouvrit la porte et le lança dehors... « Va-t-en au diable avec ton cheval » lui cria-t-il « et prends garde ». Il n'acheva sa phrase et se mit à fouiller dans un coin.

« Tu es un brave garçon, Biruk », lui dis-je, quand je fus revenu de mon étonnement.

Rollinat
BN, Slaves 68, f^o 69v

La main de Biruck s'abatit sur l'épaule du paysanje m'élançai à son secours.

—« Touchez pas, maître! » me cria le forestier d'un ton menaçant. Sans m'effrayer de ses menaces, j'allais étendre le bras... quand, à ma grande stupéfaction, je le vis, en un tour de main, enlever la ceinture des bras du prisonnier, le prendre au collet, lui enfoncer son bonnet sur les yeux, ouvrir la porte et le pousser dehors, en lui criant : —« Va-t-en au diable, toi es [sic] ton cheval!... mais prends garde que je ne t'y rattrape! »

Il rentra dans la chambre et s'enforça dans un coin.

—« Vraiment, Biruck,—lui dis-je enfin,— tu m'as étonné : je vois que tu es un brave garçon!

⁶⁵ Given that, sixty years since Mikhail Alekseev suggested the need for attention to be paid to Turgenev's role as a translator, efforts to evaluate his work as a translator are still critically handicapped by the fact that a very significant number of his actual translations are largely unavailable, it would seem timely to consider the publication of Turgenev's translations in an electronic format that conforms to the standards set by the international Text Encoding Initiative (see <http://www.tei-c.org/>). Not only would this medium make the preparing of these translations by a geographically dispersed team easier and the translations themselves more widely available, but it would make it possible (particularly from an economic point of view) to present these translations in a side-by-side view with the texts from which they have been translated (especially important when that text was not the version that has since become canonical). It is my hope that this paper to this conference may serve as an impulse to set this task into motion.

Table continues from p. 174:

Записки охотника
S². 3.162

—Э, полноте, барин, — перебил он меня с досадой, — не извольте только сказывать. Да уж я лучше вас провожу, — прибавил он, — зная дождика-то вам не переждать...

На дворе застучали колеса мужишкой телеги.

—Вишь, поплелся! — пробормотал он, да я его!..

Через полчаса он простился со мной на опушке леса.

Delaveau

Éd. de 1859, pp. 67–68

—Birouk le saisit par l'épaule... Je courus au secours du paysan.

—Laissez-le, maître! — me cria le forestier.

—Cette injonction ne m'intimida pas, et je portais déjà les mains en avant; mais à mon grand étonnement, Birouk dénoua subitement le kouchak qui liait les bras du paysan, et saisissant celui-ci par la nuque, ouvrit la porte, et le poussa dehors.

Turgenev
MS Musée Tourguéniev

« Eh! voyons, Monsieur, me répondit-il avec dépit « avez-vous toujours l'intention de partir? La pluie a cessé. — J'espère que vous ne parlerez pas de ce qui vient de se passer », ajouta-t-il brusquement. — Le bruit de la charrette du paysan qui partait retentit dans la cour. — « Le voilà qui part », marmotta Birouk avec un demi-sourire... « Mais qu'il prenne garde une autre fois. » Il me regarda fixement en prononçant ces dernières paroles. « Partons, Monsieur. »

Un quart d'heure plus tard nous nous séparions sur la lisière de la forêt.

Charrière

Éd. de 1854, pp.206–207

Le Bireouk lui posa ses mains sur les épaules avec violence... je me précipitai au secours du malheureux. « Ne bougez pas, vous, bârine! » me cria le forestier.

Je me serais moquer de ses menaces, et j'avais déjà les muscles crispés; mais, à mon grand étonnement, en un tour de main, il détordit et retira la ceinture qui serrait les poignets du paysan, lui enfonça le bonnet sur les yeux, tout en ouvrant la porte, et, le prenant par l'épaule, le poussa dehors.

Rollinat
BN, Slaves 68, f° 69v

—« Hé laissons cela, maître,—fit-il en m'interrompant avec dépit;—« mais au moins n'allez pas jaser. Aussi bien, je vais vous reconduire, ajouta-t-il, car vous n'attendrez pas la fin de la pluie. »

Le roulement d'un chariot de paysan se fit entendre dans la cour.

—« Voyez!... le voilà déjà décampé... murmure-t-il, mais il me payera ça!...

Une demi heure après, il me faisait ses adieux à la lisière du bois.

Table continues from p. 175

Delaveau

Éd. de 1859, pp. 67–68

— Va-t-en au diable, avec ton cheval! — lui cria-t-il en le voyant s'éloigner, — et rappelle-toi que si jamais je te reprends...

Cela dit, le forestier rentra tranquillement dans l'isba, ferma la porte, et se mit à remuer je ne sais quoi dans un coin.

— Vraiment, Birouk, — lui dis-je, — tu m'as étonné... Tu es un brave homme, à ce que je vois...

— Allons! Maître, ne parlons pas de cela,— me répondit-il d'un ton d'impatience. — Mais n'allez pas le raconter. Je vais maintenant vous reconduire, car il paraît que la pluie ne cessera pas de sitôt. Ah! le voilà qui détale! — ajouta-t-il à demi voix en entendant le bruit que faisaient les roues d'une téléga qui passait devant les fenêtres de l'isba. — Ah! je le...

— Une demi-heure après je prends congé de lui sur la lisière du bois.

Charrière

Éd. de 1854, pp.206–207

« Va au diable avec ton cheval! lui cria-t-il; mais une autre fois ne me retombe pas sous la main. »

Il revint sur ses pas dans la chambre, et alla regarder les deux enfants.

« Eh bien, Bireouk, finis-je par lui dire, tu m'as étonné et réjoui; je vois que tu es un brave homme.

—Eh! laissez cela, bérine, dit-il d'un ton fort maussade. ... seulement, veuillez n'en rien dire. Ce qu'il y a de mieux à faire pour moi, c'est de vous accompagner, ajouta-t-il; attendre ici la fin de la pluie, vous n'en auriez pas vous-même la patience. »

Nous entendimes le bruit du cheval et des roues du paysan, et celui de la barrière qui retombait. « Le voilà parti, murmura Foma, mais qu'il y revienne! »

Une demi-heure après, le Bireouk me fit ses adieux à la lisière de la forêt.

ALLAN REID is Acting Associate Dean of Arts and Chair of the Department of Culture and Language Studies at the University of New Brunswick. He has published on various topics primarily in twentieth-century Russian literature, including Lotman, Bakhtin, Aksenov, Babel' and Gorbanevskaia. His current research focus is on a literary biography of Natal'ia Gorbanevskaia.

GUNTER SCHAARSCHMIDT (M.A., Alberta; Ph.D., Indiana) is Professor emeritus of Russian in the Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies at the University of Victoria, BC. Highlights in his publishing career include two books on Sorbian (Heidelberg 1998; Munich 2002, 2004²) as well as, during the past ten years, a number of articles on the language of the Doukhobor Russians in Canada. He is currently at work on a trilingual dictionary (Sorbian-German-English) and on a grammatical description of Doukhobor Russian.

GEORGE THOMAS is Professor Emeritus of Slavic linguistics at McMaster University. He is the author of three monographs and numerous articles, mainly in the field of socio- and historical linguistics. His main current area of interest is the impact of language contact (intra- and extra-Slavic) on the Slavic languages spoken in the former Habsburg Empire.

NICHOLAS G. ŽEKULIN is Professor of Russian in the Department of Germanic, Slavic & East Asian Studies at the University of Calgary, where he has taught since 1971. His primary research interest is Ivan Turgenev. Since 1998 he has been the Canadian representative to the International Committee of Slavists.