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Abstract
Marina Tsvetaeva’s “poetics of the word”: a comparative analysis of English and Polish translations of the poem “A sledujušij’ raz – gluhonemaja”... (“But the next time – deaf-mute”...)

The aim of my article is to reveal the characteristic qualities of Tsvetaeva’s “poetics of the word” and to present the translators’ approach to it through a comparative analysis of an English and a Polish rendition of the poem “A sledujušij’ raz – gluhonemaja”... (“But the next time – deaf-mute”...). In the first part of the article I present the poet’s approach to the word. In the second part I analyze the structure of the original poem and specify the criteria for evaluating the translations. The third part contains the discussion of the equivalence of the translations.
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Introduction
Marina Tsvetaeva’s creative path evolved from “the poetics of everyday life to the poetics of the word”, as Mikhail Gasparov¹ (1995: 307), a renowned Russian literary critic and linguist, put it. She was born in 1892 to Maria Mein, a concert pianist, and Ivan Tsvetaev, a professor and the founder of the Alexander III Museum of Fine Arts in Moscow (today the Pushkin Museum). She started writing poetry when she was twelve. In her early poems, the young Tsvetaeva was preoccupied with her own private world. There is an echo of her conversations with her mother and her sister in their upper-class home; her poetic objects were the details of her room. The poems reflect her literary diet at the time and imagined dialogues with historic and literary heroes. Around 1916–1917, Tsvetaeva’s style takes a turn. Her new path leads her “to the language conscious area of the Russian literary tradition (...). In the mature Cvetaeva, words are not used to connote or to imply or to suggest; they are selected equally on the basis of their shape, sound and meaning, each of these qualities being equally necessary

for the total poetic impression”\(^2\). The aim of my article is to reveal the characteristic qualities of Tsvetaeva’s “poetics of the word” and to present the translators’ approach to it through a comparative analysis of an English and a Polish rendition of the poem “A sledujuši’ raz – gluhonemaja”... (“But the next time – deaf-mute”...).

1. Marina Tsvetaeva’s “poetics of the word”

In her moral and poetic credo “Art in the Light of Conscience”, Tsvetaeva states (partly ironically):

“It is more important to be a person, because it is more useful... With the exception of parasites in all their various forms – everyone is more useful than we [poets] are. And knowing this, having signed my name to it in full possession of my faculties of reason and being of firm memory, I attest that I would not exchange my own occupation for any other. Knowing the greater, I do the lesser. Therefore there can be no forgiveness for me. At the Last Judgement of conscience, only those such I will be called to accounting. But if there is a Last Judgement of the word – there I am innocent”\(^3\).

In the same essay, she declares accountability for her art:

“[T]he earth, when it gives birth, is not responsible, but a person, when he creates, is responsible. Because the sprouting earth has one will: to sprout, but a person should will the sprouting of the good that he is capable of knowing”\(^4\).

Tsvetaeva grew up in times of radical industrial development and strong social and historic turbulence. She belonged to the poets who longed for transcendence and believed in the power of the word. They perceived the word formation as a “cosmic process, because the word contains the energy of the world”\(^5\), to use the expression of Sergei Bulgakov, a great Russian theologian of the 20th century.

Tsvetaeva’s approach to language is perfectly in line with the thoughts of Viktor Shklovsky (one of the founders of Russian formalism), which he shared in his significant essay “The Resurrection of the Word” in 1914:

“(T)he most ancient poetic creation of man was the creation of words. Now words are dead, and language is like a graveyard, but an image was once alive in the newly-born word. Every word is basically – a trope. And often enough, when you get through to the image which is now lost and effaced, but once embedded at the basis of the word, then you are struck by its beauty – by a beauty which existed once and is now gone”\(^6\).

This is precisely what Tsvetaeva does, she perceives the words as tropes. Rather than to coin neologisms, Tsvetaeva more often expresses her concepts by connoting words

---


of similar sounds and different semantics. She invites her reader to listen to the meaning they produce together. The paronomasia is not so much a rhetorical device for her, but “an integral part of her thinking”\(^7\). Below I share an example as analysed by Simon Karlinsky:

“Я проводы вверяю проводам
И в телеграфный столб упершись – плачу”.

I entrust the farewells to the wires
And stopped by the telegraph pole, I weep.

“The last quoted example is from the cycle ‘Provodá’ (‘Telegraph Wires’), which describes a forced separation of two lovers. In the second poem of the cycle, the heroine, after comparing her sufferings to those of Phaedra and Ariadne, realizes that she cannot even perform for her lost lover the warm Russian rite of preparing him for the trip, seeing him off to the station, and bidding him farewell (прóвody). She is reduced instead to delegate her farewells to telegraph wires (provodá), which will follow his train or carry him her farewell telegram. The telegraph pole which supports these wires and makes the farewell message possible is at the same time an evocation of the ‘dumb rock of Fate’ mentioned in the German epigraph to the entire cycle (‘...wennnicht der altestumme Fels, das Schicksal, ihrentgegenstände’). It is thus both something that stops the heroine from following her lover and something that makes later contact with him (the wires run after him) possible”\(^8\).

In another poem called “Muká i múka” (“The flour and the torment”) Tsvetaeva exploits the semantic difference produced by the switch of stress in an otherwise identical arrangement of phonemes. The shift results in two meanings: ‘flour’ (мукá) and ‘torment’ (мúка) which are unrelated in our everyday speech. Tsvetaeva connects them in her belief that the process of torment is better than the powder obtained from grinding (thus tormenting) grains: that the activity is better than the result. She knows how to activate the meaning of a particular syllable contained in a word. In her verse, the verb beregis’ (‘save yourself’) means also ‘stay on the shore’ (from bereg meaning ‘a shore’) and grozit’ (‘to warn’) includes the meaning of the noun groza (‘storm’). A list of similar examples could be easily transformed into a little dictionary.

There can be no random words in Tsvetaeva’s poetry; every word needs to be indispensable\(^9\). For Gasparov, her poetics of the word consists in that in her verse “the sound


\(^9\) In a letter to her daughter, Ariadna Efron, Tsvetaeva says: “[when translating poetry] I transfer it from the kingdom of accident into the kingdom of indispensability” (http://tsvetaeva.lit-info.ru/tsvetaeva/pisma/letter-910.html – my translation).
congruity of words becomes a guiding force in the true connection between the words and concepts in the world as it was created by God and distorted by man”\(^{10}\).

The words function in context, of course. Other distinctive qualities of Tsvetaeva’s poetry (and prose) are her irregular syntax and punctuation. Her exploitation of parallel constructions, repetitions and her variety of elliptical constructions deserve a broad study. The same could be said of her use of dashes and colons. The following analysis will show, how these devices reinforce the “poetics of the word” and foreground the ideas and images that stand behind lexical items.

2. The verbal craft in the poem “A sledujuši’ raz – gluhonemaja”... ("But the next time – deaf-mute”...)  

The poem I have chosen to discuss is exceptionally “reader-friendly” and at first it seems less challenging for translators than many other poems by Tsvetaeva. This applies not only to renditions into another Slavic language, like Polish, but also to English, an inflectional West Germanic language. The poem is cast in regular syntax and its four couplets are dot-ended. It lacks startling distortions of word order and irrecoverable ellipses that would confuse its recipients, requiring extra processing effort from them. In this poem, there are no words of ancient Russian folk songs or of the Old Church Slavonic language, which occur in some of Tsvetaeva’s poems and which are particularly hard to carry across into other languages. Yet, “A sledujuši’ raz – gluhonemaja”... ("But the next time – deaf-mute”...) is highly representative of her poetic craft.

“A следующий раз – глухонемая 
Приду на свет, где всем свой стих дарю, свой слух дарю.

Ведь всё равно – что говорят – не понимаю.

Бог упаси меня – опять Коринной 
В сей край придти, где люди твёрже льдов, а льдины – скал.

Глухонемою – и с такою длинной –
– Вот – до полу – косой, чтоб не узнал!

A sledujuši’ raz – gluhonemaja
Pridu na svet, gde vsem svojstih darju, svoj sluh darju.

Ved’ vsë ravnno – çto govorjat – ne ponimaju.

---

\(^{10}\) Sibelan Forrester, A Companion to Marina Cvetaeva: Approaches to a Major Russian Poet (Brill Academic Pub., 2017), 146.
Bog upasi menja – opat’ Korinnoj
V sej kraj pridti, gde ljudi tvërže l’dov, a l’diny – skal.

Gluhonemoju – i s takoju dlinoj –
– Vot – do polu – kosoj, čtob ne uznal!

But the next time – deaf-mute
I will come to the world, where I give my verse, I give my hearing-sense to all.

For no matter – what they say – I do not understand.
For no matter – who would get it? – what I say.

God save me – from coming like Corinna again,
To this land, where people are harder than ice, and ice-floes – than rocks.

As a deaf-mute – and with such a long braid –
– Here – up to the floor – so you/he would not recognize me!”

Tsvetaeva’s poem could have a classic form of two regular quatrains rhyming abab cdcd, but she decided to divide it into four couplets with ab ab cd cd rhymes. She starts it from a clear declaration: “A sledujušij raz – gluhonemaja Pridu na svet, gde vsem svoj stih darju, svoj sluh darju”... (“But the next time – deaf-mute I will come to the world, where I give my verse, I give my hearing-sense to all”). Tsvetaeva gives a partly humorous effect to her poem, suggesting that she can decide if she will be reborn and if she will capable of hearing and speaking or not. Although the adjective gluhonemaja (‘deaf-mute’) consists of two merged words (gluhaja/’deaf’ and nemaja/’mute’), it had been used in Russian with reference to deaf people, regardless of their ability/ inability to speak. Tsvetaeva, however, consciously exploits the semantics of both parts of the adjective. The bitter irony of her opening declaration pertains to the connection between her future deafness and her present disposition to give her hearing sense and between her future being mute and her present capacity to give her verse (poems being the most precious type of utterances for a poet). In her vision, her existing talents will be invalid in the next life.

Forming the repetition “svoj stih darju, svoj sluh darju”/“I give my verse, I give my hearing sense” and exploiting the phonetic closeness of the monosyllables stih/“verse” and sluh/“hearing sense”, the poet motivates us to find the connection between the semantics of these two items. Normally we would associate a poem with the human

11 My close to literal translation – JP.

12 It is only in our times that political correctness demands cancelling the second part of the word (for even if the person lacks phonetic speech, s/he can still speak using sign language).
capacity to speak and to express oneself, but Tsvetaeva looks at it from another angle. When she puts the words stih and sluh in the same relevant position of her phrases, they seem to be used as synonyms. She regards poetry as a reaction to hearing something, thus as an effect brought about by absorbing information.

In the second stanza, Tsvetaeva openly explains why she would return “deaf-mute”. The reason is that nobody understands her and she does not understand anybody in this world. The inescapability of the poet’s separation from the crowd is expressed by vse ravnio/“whatever” The idea of disunion becomes highlighted by the parallel construction of the couplet. Parallel lines are iconic of their general message: the poet and the people exist side by side, but there is a constant distance between them (just like between two parallel lines).

In the third couplet, Tsvetaeva continues with her comments on the irresponsiveness of the world. She constructs a gradation of her impression about it. According to her, “people are harder than ice, and ice-floes are harder than rocks”, ice and rocks being classic metaphors of indifference and coldness.

With the first word of the final couplet, the poet takes us back to the first line. This time gluhonemajaja functions as a noun, not as an adjective, but its recurrence is remarkable (only the two final letters are changed due to inflection). The role of this repetition is twofold. On the one hand, it gives prominence to the idea behind the word, on the other it serves as a reference to the context that helps the reader reconstruct the verb ellipsis (ø) in line 7 with the verb priyti/ “to come” (pridu/ “I will come”) from the line 1:

“Gluhonemaju ø [pridu] – i s takoju dlinnoj –

“As a deaf-mute ø [I will come] – and with such a long [braid]”

It is worth mentioning that in both lines, 1 and 7, the word gluhonemajaja is separated from the other words by a dash. The punctuation obtains iconic features in these lines. The formal, graphical isolation of the word corresponds with the notion of the poet’s separation from society.

The grammar of the last stanza is based on the native ear rather than on literary norms. Having elaborated on the social reasons for being a misfit, the lyric “I” shifts here to the more private motivation for her coming back strikingly different. She reveals she does not want the man she (probably) cares about to recognize her. Tsvetaeva’s syntax becomes elliptical and loose, and thus more personal. The deictic presentative vot/‘here’ “can be used, especially when accompanied by a gesture, to demonstrate something”.

---

13 When I use the term ‘iconicity’, I mean ‘diagrammatic iconicity’, which is “a systematic arrangement of signs, none of which necessarily resembles its referent, but whose relationships to each other mirror the relationships of their referents” (Haiman 1980: 515); for surveys on iconicity in poetry, please see Nanny 2005 or the book series Iconicity in Language and Literature that has been published by John Benjamins Publishing Company since 1999.

The lyric “I” uses it to refer to the length of her kosa. This moment involves a lexical pun: kosa could mean ‘a braid’ or to ‘a scythe’. The first option brings about associations with love stories and fairy tales, where beautiful heroines have long hair (like the brothers Grimm’s Rapuntzel or Russian folk beauties named Vasilisas or Elenas). The second one produces associations with Death, which is feminine in Slavic cultures, and whose symbolic instrument is a scythe. However, for the communicative goals it would be rather weird to describe a scythe as reaching to the floor: its handle is long by definition, thus it is not necessary to mention this. The love motive seems more apt and it connects well with Tsvetaeva mentioning the man she has in mind. In photographs she always has a short, boyish haircut. It would be very unlike her to have a long braid and it could make her unrecognizable.

Up to this moment we have pointed to the most outstanding means of the “poetics of the word” in this text. They involve:
(a) structuring a syntactic repetition in order to connect the words stih/’verse’ and słuh/’hearing sense’ – a move which sets a link between words of similar phonetics, but different semantics;
(b) the iconicity of the parallel construction of the second couplet;
(c) the word repetition emphasised by dashes;
(d) a lexical pun based on the double meaning of the word kosa, which lets the poet provoke two different groups of associations (‘a braid’ or ‘a scythe’).

Rendering the above-listed rhetorical devices and faithfulness to the meaning will constitute the central criteria for our judging the equivalence of the English and Polish translations of the poem.

3. Comparative analysis of Polish and English translations of the poem

The Polish rendition of the poem belongs to a book of translations “Hardość i Słabość” (2018) penned by Zbigniew Dmitroca. The English version was taken from a collection “Moscow in the Plague Year” prepared by Christopher Whyte (2014). Dmitroca and Whyte translated mostly Tsvetaeva’s poems from her most productive years, when she was about thirty years old. Both books were published within the same decade and both translators offered more than one hundred poems, which – as they declare – appear in their languages for the first time.

A quick glance at the two translations printed on one page, reveals structural differences right away. Dmitroca saves the original arrangement of the dot-ended couplets and their regular rhyme pattern. Whyte reorganises Tsvetaeva’s poem into couplets and triplets, broken by enjambments and not rhymed. This contrast inspires at least two questions: Will the translations differ so strikingly also in content, and will Dmitroca’s version prevail over Whyte’s in its faithfulness to other aspects of the original?

“But when I come again into this world
where I bestow on everyone my verse,
my ear, I will be deaf and dumb. No matter what
they say, I cannot understand a word,  
nor can they understand a thing I say.

May God preserve me! Returning, a second  
Corinna, to this land where men are harder  
Than ice, and ice-floes than a cliff! My pony-tail  

reaching down to the floor, and deaf and dumb,  
so there’s no danger I’ll be recognized”.  

*translated by Christopher Whyte*

"Następnym razem – głucha i niemowa  
Przyjdę na świat, gdzie wszystkim swój wiersz,  
swój słuch dam w darze.

Wszystko jedno – co mówią – nie pojmę ni słowa.  

Bóg mnie uchowa – znów jako Korynna  
Przyjść do kraju, gdzie ludzie twardsi niż lód, lód –  
od kamienia.

Głuchoniema – z długą – tak jak żadna inna –  
Kosą, żebym nie nie poznął z wrażenia".

*translated by Zbigniew Dmitroca*

Tsvetaeva begins her poem with a prediction of her next coming. Her vision turns out  
to be based on her current experience. For this reason she makes a tense/aspect switch  
from the future into the present tense:

“А следующий раз – глухонемая  
Приду на свет, где всем свой вiersz, свой слух дарю”.

A sledujušij raz – gluhonemaja  
Pridu na svet, gde vsem svoj stih darju, svoj sluh darju”.

15 My close to literal rendition of Z. Dmitroca’s translation – JP.
“But the next time – deaf-mute
I will come to the world, where I give my verse, I give my hearing-sense to all”.

Dmitroca puts everything into the perspective of future tense:

“Następnym razem – głucha i niemowa
Przyjdę na świat, gdzie wszystkim swój wiersz, swój słuch dam w darze”.

“The next time – deaf and mute
I will come into the world, where I will give my verse, my hearing-sense to all”.

First of all, such a statement is logically inconsistent: how would a deaf and mute person give her hearing sense? Secondly, it implies that the lyric persona is preoccupied with her future, while this is not the case for Tsvetaeva. In the original text, her remark on what she will do serves mainly as an impulse for a deeper contemplation of her present life.

When it comes to the English translation, Whyte faithfully renders the sense of the original declaration. However, he changes the order of its parts: first he describes the ongoing context and after that the future reaction:

“But when I come again into this world
where I bestow on everyone my verse,
my ear, I will be deaf and dumb”.

Such rearrangement in sentence structure results in making the effect more prominent than the cause. The original logic is saved, but Tsvetaeva’s point of view is shifted.

Neither in Polish nor in English is it possible to find nouns denoting ‘verse’ and ‘hearing’ that would sound similar. There is no phonetic similarity between the words słuch and wiersz or verse and hearing. The translators could save the notion of a connection between these two words only by preserving the syntactic repetition based on the reappearance of the possessive pronoun svoj/’(my) own’ and the verb darit’/’to give’: svoj stih darju, svoj sluh darju/’I give my verse, I give my hearing-sense’. Dmitroca and Whyte partly make use of this solution. They neglect the recurrence of the verbs, but save the repetition of the pronouns. They also render the original order in which Tsvetaeva lists her goods: first the verse and then the hearing.

Whyte chooses to modify the original metrics and restructures the first stanza into three lines. He reverts to a couplet straight away, with the second stanza. This move gives him the opportunity to form a parallel construction visually separated from other lines, but he does not follow through. Whyte ignores the iconic potential of parallel sentences, which would strongly reinforce the expression of “whateverness”. The rhetorical exposure of Tsvetaeva’s message is in turn saved in the Polish translation, as Dmitroca copies the original structure. Nonetheless, his version suffers from a failure on the lexical level. Tsvetaeva’s Govorju /’I say’ is translated as gwarzę which refers to ‘chatting; talking
in informal, friendly way’. Bearing in mind the poet’s word-awareness, gwarzę depreciates the dignity of her craft. Dmitroca’s semantic and stylistic inaccuracy could be explained (though not really justified) here by his aspiration to construct a rhyme (darzę – gwarzę [dazhe – gvazhel]).

Struggling for rhymes often results in inadequate lexis modifications in poetic translation. Another example is Dmitroca’s choice for the word gluhonemaja. He does not use its exact Polish equivalent gluchoniema/’deaf-mute’ in the first couplet. Instead, in order to generate a rhyme between the lines 1 and 3, Dmitroca creates a description composed of an adjective and a noun glucha (adj.) i niemowa (n.)/’deaf and a mute’. He does not, however, repeat the same expression in the last stanza. Being inconsistent in his choice, he puts there gluchoniema. In effect, he deprives the original text of the rhetoric repetition, which foregrounds the concept behind the word Glu honiemaja and creates a straight link between the last stanza and the opening one. This repetition is rendered in the English translation. Whyte uses the expression deaf and dumb twice. Its rhythmic and alliterative values add to the rhetorical effect of the verse.

As to translating the Russian word kosa, which has two meanings (both being adequate in the given context), the Polish and the English translators each take a different path. Dmitroca opts for the associations with Death and translates it as kosa/’scythe’. Whyte focuses on the attribute of physical attractiveness (female hair), but he renders kosa not as a braid (the literal equivalent in English) but as a pony-tail. For stylistic purposes, his lexical choice does not bring any connotations with fairy tales or folk stereotypes of a beautiful mistress. It rather makes the lyric I look more contemporary (a pony-tail being rather a post-war hair style), which may be advantageous in bringing the heroine closer to nowadays readers.

Studying Dmitroca’s and Whyte’s renditions of the last stanza, we find one more striking difference between them. It is necessary to point out here that the Russian phrase Čtob ne uznal (line 8) can be translated as ‘so you [male] did not recognize’ or ‘so he did not recognize’. The first interpretation turns a man into the addressee of the utterance, the second one makes him unidentified. In the English version we do not receive any of these two options. Whyte uses the passive voice and cancels the presence of the mysterious man from Tsvetaeva’s imaginary:

“(…) and deaf and dumb,
so there’s no danger I’ll be recognized”.

Due to his translation the lyric persona will not be recognized by anybody in general, not just by a specific person. Whyte does not save the persona’s shift of attention from her relationship with the crowd/people to her relationship with a man. The translation sounds more official and objective than the original personal confession.

Polish grammar, similarly to English, does not allow one to construct an exact copy of the ambiguous Russian sentence. In Dmitroca’s version he functions as the subject

---

16 The phrase is now antiquated and might be perceived as insulting nowadays (dumb meaning ‘stupid’), especially in American English. However, in the past it was a valid way to describe someone who was deaf and mute.
of the subordinate sentence: żęby mnie nie pozna/’so he wouldn’t recognize me’. The man, thus, cannot be perceived as the addressee of the lyric utterance. He stays totally unidentified, but at least – in comparison with Whyte’s translation – he is present in the poem. In effect, the Polish translation sounds more personal than the English one, but is also more officious than the original poem.

4. Conclusions

Brief as this case-study is, it is aimed at presenting some problematic issues to be tackled in the translation of Tsvetaeva’s “poetics of the word”. The poet was able to extract stylistic effects from very subtle means. Tsvetaeva managed to foreground her ideas without inventing neologisms or unconventional syntax. The suggestiveness of her verse can strive on the diagrammatic iconicity and ambiguity of lexis. Even her (mischievously) simple poems require careful reading.

The poetic equivalence of translation depends not only on transferring linguistic tropes and their stylistic effects, but also on preserving the original message. This principle is as old in theory as it is often disobeyed in practice. Dmitorca and Whyte each partly succeed in preserving the crucial elements of Tsvetaeva’s verbal craft. However, Tsvetaeva’s message sometimes is missing in translations. To certain extent it results from the translator’s following language restrictions that could not be circumnavigated. Yet, in some cases, they neglect rhetoric means that could have been easily rendered in their respective languages. The results of their works are of comparable quality and they are summed up in Table 1.

Table 1. Comparison of the Polish and English translations of the poem “Sledushchij raz”...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means of Marina Tsvetaeva’s poetic craft</th>
<th>Translation by Z. Dmitroca (Polish)</th>
<th>Translation by Whyte (English)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. logic structure of the opening declaration (line 1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. connection of words the stih/’verse’ and sluh/’hearing sense’ by phonetic similarity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. structuring a syntactic repetition in order to connect the words stih and sluh (line 2)</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>-/+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. iconicity of the parallel construction of the second couplet (lines 3 and 4)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. the word repetition (lines 1 and 7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. a lexical pun based on the double meaning of the word kosa (line 8)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. syntactic ambiguity of the verb phrase (line 8)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. switch from social to private reasons of the poet’s isolation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If we graded every “+” from Table 1 with one point, we could notice that both translators achieve equal number of scores. The comparative analysis of the English and Polish translations of Marina Tsvetaeva’s poem proves that rendering a linguistically multilayered poem into a similar language system will not necessarily result in a more equivalent translation than when the same poem is transferred into a very different language.
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