

Lexicon and rhetoric in Fet's translation of Goethe's *Hermann und Dorothea*

Emily Klenin

University of California, Los Angeles
e-mail: klenin@ucla.edu

Abstract. A. A. Fet's translation of J. W. Goethe's *Hermann und Dorothea* is an important early example of Fet's lifelong practice as a translator and attests to his well-known fidelity to his source texts. His strongest preference is to maintain the versification characteristics of his source, but the degree of his lexical-semantic fidelity is also very strong and far outranks fidelity on other levels (phonetic, grammatical). The poet evidently translated holistically within very small textual domains, within which he sometimes isolated pivots of core semantic information (which he located in translation as they were in the original), around which less important material was fitted, insofar as space permitted. In Fet's text, versification limitations sometimes led to lexical-semantic mismatches of semantic denotation, and these mismatches are characterized in the paper: they typically involve repetitions, repeated mentions, or known information, and the mismatch may entail full or partial loss or enrichment of the semantics of the original. In addition, conflicts sometimes arise between denotative requirements within the local domain and the cumulative (usually connotative) associations generated across the larger domain of the whole text. When such conflicts arise, Fet resolves them in favour of small-domain accuracy, resulting in semantic changes ('shifts') in the domain of the poetic text, which thereby loses some rhetorical or poetic force, relative to the original. Dissonance between large- and small-domain semantics is often inevitable, because of the language-specific nature of connotation. To the extent that the semantics of Fet's translation are a consequence of his personal preferences, they may be viewed in the context of, first, his early school training (not far behind him when he translated *Hermann und Dorothea*) and, second, his status as both professional poet, writing in Russian, and educated native German-Russian bilingual.

Introduction

Afanasi Fet's 1842 translation of *Hermann und Dorothea* occupies a special place among his translations not only because it was his first translation of a long work by Goethe, but also because he probably first read it as a classroom assignment. In Fet's time the poem was widely taught in German-language schools, and it was especially popular in German-language classrooms outside Germany (Beutler 1935, Helmerking 1948). In 1835–1838 Fet attended a German boarding school in Werro, now Võru in Estonia, and his German teacher, proud of having taught at Weimar and of having seen the great man himself, taught Goethe's works enthusiastically (Eisenschmidt 1860). Since the schoolboy Fet was already writing original poems and translating German ones into Russian, his classroom experience of *Hermann und Dorothea* may well have influenced how he translated it just a few years later. Throughout his career, Fet's aim as a translator was to offer the sort of interlinear gloss that schoolchildren use (Gessen 1960), and he describes schoolroom translating even in his last memoir (RG 93). Thus, his early language classes may have informed his lifelong approach to translation; his *Hermann und Dorothea*, one of his most successful translations (cf. von Gronicka 1985: 101), marks an important early milestone in his practice as a translator and connects the later practice with his earliest training. The importance of Fet's school experience has been ignored because his *Hermann und Dorothea* was published only much later, and Fet's own recollection of working on it early in his university days was ignored until documentary correspondence was found (Grigor'ev 1999: 6).

When Fet decided to translate *Hermann und Dorothea*, he was probably most interested in the challenge presented by its hexameter metre (Klenin 2011); however, the text he produced also exemplifies the lexical accuracy typical of his translations from German. Fet valued the accuracy of his translations over any other quality, and this strong preference has sometimes been viewed as a weakness, detrimental to poetic value and a sign of the much vexed Fetian duality: Fet the poet versus Shenshin the translator (and military officer and landowner and human being). Yet the accuracy of Fet's translations can also be viewed as complementing the elusiveness of his original poems: whether as poet or as translator, Fet always invites readers into a poetic world beyond his own verbal signs. To be sure, the original poetry and translations diverge in the values that dominate their lexical semantics. Fet's original poems sacrifice the usual core meanings of words in favour of occasional lexical idiosyncrasy, and a word's non-denotative associations; its connotations, in the

broadest sense, often override denotation as the dominant value of a word as Fet uses it in his poems. In contrast, Fet's translations so precisely match the denotations evoked by the original vocabulary that they sometimes sacrifice a word's associative, or connotative, aura. For this reason, Fet's translated text is a good witness to his literal understanding of the original work, but sometimes not to his understanding of its poetic values. In the discussion below, Fet's preferences as a translator are analyzed and viewed in the context of his linguistic situation and his artistic and professional sensibilities.

Fet's lexical choices are limited by versificational ones: given that his translation is equimetrical, tends to preserve original rhythmic organization, and is intended to match the meaning of his original line-by-line, Fet's strongest preference constraining his word choice is always to fit the words he chooses into the semantically corresponding line, as metrically defined. Fet's results usually impress by their integration of lexical and metrical needs, but, when versification demands, some denotative detail is suppressed, generally in words that most readers would consider unimportant, in a sense that will be defined below. In addition, Fet's choices are also constrained by immediate linguistic (syntactic, phraseological, and semantic) context: given a range of near-synonyms, one or another word choice may be more or less required by the particular collocation in which it occurs. This last constraint, in turn, derives from the limitations of lexical correspondence across languages. Thus, analyzing Fet's translation of *Hermann und Dorothea* should take into account both the poet's personal preferences and the constraints imposed on him by the language systems within which he was working.

The discussion below focuses on the lexical semantics of Fet's translation, with only passing mention of versificational, phonetic, and grammatical issues. In the lexical realm, our analysis differentiates apparent personal preferences from choices imposed on the translator by his need to cross back and forth between two languages, each with its own language-specific lexical organization and characteristics. In addition, it will be suggested below that some of the apparently idiosyncratic preferences typical of Fet's work may be usefully seen in the context of his status as an educated native bilingual in Russian and German – that is, Fet's own situation relative to the two language systems, which are usually considered separate, but which may be less clearly so for a native bilingual.

1. Domains and pivots

Fet aimed at line-by-line accuracy, but the domain of correspondence between his translations and their source text is often even narrower. As an example, compare Goethe's lines (9, 269–70)¹ with Fet's version (typesfaces have been chosen to show sections of text with exact syllable-by-syllable matches):

*NUR EIN FREMDLING, sagt man mit Recht, ist der Mensch hier auf Erden;
Mehr ein Fremdling als jemals ist nun ein jeder geworden.*²

[Only a sojourner, says one rightly, is man here on the earth;
More a sojourner than ever is now each one become.]

Как справедливо твердят, человек на земле ТОЛЬКО СТРАННИК.
Более странником стал теперь, чем когда либо, каждый:

[As is rightly affirmed, man on earth is only a wanderer.
More a wanderer now than ever is each one become.]

Within the first of the two lines, Fet matches not just the line but the syllable counts of small syntactic units: initial *Nur ein Fremdling* becomes line-final *только странник*, and *ist der Mensch* becomes *человек*; *auf Erden* matches *на земле*. Because hexameter is not strictly syllabotonic, the place of stress in the matched phrases can float: unlike the translations of *nur ein Fremdling* and *ist der Mensch*, which match both syllabically and in main stress, the translation of *auf Erden* relocates stress to the final syllable of the phrase. On a broader, rhetorical, level, Goethe's graduated parallelism *Nur ein Fremdling ... Mehr ein Fremdling* is rendered chiasmically, the final *странник* of the first line reappearing at the beginning of the second one. One might expect metrical and semantic faithfulness to conflict, but this example shows that Fet's approach was highly localized in orientation, but also apparently holistic: Fet evidently focused on a single phrase and tried to put in its place a semantically comparable Russian phrase that would occupy an equivalent amount of space in the line.

As lines (9, 269–70) illustrate, Fet's translations were oriented toward small textual domains, defined both versificationally (generally by the line or hemistich, but sometimes by larger units, such as a passage) and syntactically (by the phrase). As we will see, Fet's attention to small domains sometimes

¹ References to *Hermann und Dorothea* are to canto and line number.

² The orthography of both Russian and German examples has been modernized throughout.

dampens connotative values that emerge only in the larger domain of the whole poem. The congruence of 'large domain' and 'small domain' values in Goethe's original text contributes significantly to its harmonious neo-classical poetics, and its loss changes the rhetorical structure of the poem. Connotations are often language-specific, which means, first, that translators cannot entirely avoid connotative loss, no matter how well aware they may be of subtleties in the original, and, second, that exploring this aspect of Fet's translation of *Hermann und Dorothea* illuminates not so much Fet's response to the text as it does the limits of German-Russian lexical correspondence.

In addition to restriction by domain, Fet's translations are also often characterized by the presence of pivots. Pivots are points in a translated domain at which original semantic values have been left inviolate, occupying their original textual locations, while other values have been adjusted to fit around the pivot into the remaining versificational space in the domain. Thus, in the following lines, Dorothea quotes her deceased fiancé's speech informing her that he is leaving for France (9, 262–63):

*„Lebe glücklich“, sagt er. „Ich gehe; denn alles bewegt sich
Jetzt auf Erden einmal, es scheint sich alles zu trennen.
[“Farewell”, said he. “I go, for everything is moving
Now on earth, it seems that everything is coming apart.]*

In Russian he says:

*Друг мой, сказал он, прости. Я иду, потому что на свете
Все, как кажется мне, уничтожены прочные связи:
[My dear, said he, farewell. I go, because on earth,
as it seems to me, all firm ties have been destroyed.]*

In both languages, the key statement of intent (“I am leaving”) occupies three syllables in the third and fourth feet of the line, immediately after a main caesura: *ich gehe ~ я иду*. Fet seems to have considered the statement of intent crucial; he uses it to pivot away from the stereotypical introductory phrase and toward the speaker's justification. The matching of *ich gehe* and *я иду* follows the translator's general preference for keeping key ideas in the positions Goethe had assigned them, but the perfect match stands out especially in this speech, because, in other respects, the Russian version noticeably diverges from the German one. First, the Russian farewell starts with an endearment (*друг мой*) lacking in the original: Goethe's fiancé does not start by evoking

any affectionate relationship with his addressee. Second, the lack of such an endearment is characteristic of the fiancé as Goethe presents him. The German text, unlike the Russian one is purposefully repetitive: *alles* is in motion, *alles* is dividing. In German, the imminent departure of the fiancé is thus part of a universal movement emanating directly from revolution; the Russian translation lacks this meaning, specifying instead the notions of separation and dissolution of bonds: the lovers are to be separated because all firm ties in the world have been destroyed. Fet's translation preserves the core of the fiancé's speech, but, through semantic narrowing of reference, backgrounds the universal cataclysmic force that impels the fiancé's behaviour. The relative backgrounding of European events and foregrounding of the personal relationship is embodied in Fet's lexical over-specification, relative to the original, even as he leaves the pivotal *ich gehe* exactly as he finds it.

2. Mismatches and other small-domain adjustments of meaning

The deceased fiancé's speech is a well-defined passage, in which original and translation match not only line-by-line but in important respects even down to the level of the half-line. This narrow domain of correspondence throws Fet's choices into relief, for example when he "mismatches" by starting the speech with an endearment lacking in the original, or by overspecifying the noun phrases that follow. In general, mismatches in Fet's translation nearly always involve repetitions, multiple mentions of the same referent, or information that one may reasonably assume is already known either to the addressee in the text or to the reader. Obviously, since poetry does not reside in informational value or in avoiding repetition, these information-level efficiencies do not advance the poetic qualities of the original, nor were they intended to do so. Rather, the mismatches seem nearly always to have been introduced in the interest of enabling the translator to preserve semantic or versificational values that he considered more important than the ones he sacrificed. The mismatches within the small domains of the text typically fall into one of the following categories:

1. Words redundant in the original may be eliminated in the translation.
2. Words that are not very informative (epithets, non-autosemantic words such as pronouns, and clichés) may be eliminated or replaced. If they are replaced, the replacement may represent either loss or increase in semantic specification.

2.1. Redundancy

Redundancies help create the texture of a poem, but Fet's absolute preference for versificational equivalence within small domains tends to promote lexical economies: he is measuring phrases made up of Russian words into the same metrical space as corresponding German ones, but German words are often shorter. Thus, for example, in German, Dorothea has the following line of ten words (9, 291), in which she is thinking back to her deceased fiancé's parting words:

Alles verlor ich indes, und tausendmal dacht' ich der Warnung
[Meanwhile I lost everything, and a thousand times I thought on the warning]

but the corresponding line in Russian holds only eight:

Все утратя, я тысячу раз эту речь вспоминала.
[Having lost everything, I recalled this speech a thousand times.]

Fitting nearly everything in, Fet nonetheless saves a syllable by having Dorothea refer to the fiancé's 'speech' (*речь*) instead of his *Warnung*. Since she has just quoted the whole discourse, its value as *Warnung* is clear and the word itself redundant. It is, however, part of the original and serves primarily a rhetorical purpose, not an informational one. When the word disappears, the rhetoric associated with Dorothea, and with the final section of the poem, becomes less urgent.

2.2. Epithets

The most obvious redundancies of Goethe's *Hermann und Dorothea* are epithets mimicking the fixed epithets of classical epic. As might be expected from the fact that the epithets are generally uninformative, Fet translates them much more freely than he does the rest of the text, and, as one might expect in the 'crowded' equimetrical translation, many of Goethe's epithets are sacrificed (*mein trefflicher Freund* 'my excellent friend' becomes simply *мой друг* 'my friend', *der kluge Pfarrer* 'the wise pastor' becomes just *настой* 'the pastor').

In addition, Fet may retain all or part of the lexical content of an epithet, but replace an adjective with the corresponding adverb: *Und es versetzte darauf die kluge, verständige Hausfrau* [And there responded thereto the prudent, sensible

housewife] becomes *И на слова его так отвечала разумно хозяйка* [And thus to his words the housewife sensibly answered]. The adjustment saves space but eliminates the classical-epic allusion. The choice corresponds to another general preference in Fet's translation: just as versification outranks lexicon, similarly lexical semantics outrank grammatical (hierarchical) relationships in Fet's own hierarchy of values to be preserved in translation. Overall, he tends to locate lexical semantic values more or less where they were in the linear and metrical space of the source text, but is relatively indifferent to their morphological status, part of speech, and syntax.

Epithets can not only disappear or lose part of their semantic weight, but can also take on greater lexical specification than in the original: Goethe's all-purpose *trefflich* 'excellent' can become *рассудительный* 'sensible' or *добродушный* 'good-natured' (pastor), *почтительный* 'deferential' or *кроткий* 'meek' (son), *достойная* 'worthy' (housewife), or *добрый* 'good' (innkeeper) – whatever 'excellence' in a given role might mean in the context. Here, Fet's translation shares a characteristic typical of many translations: he somewhat exaggerates a tendency present in the original. Goethe's epithets are a response to the fixed epithet of classical epic, but his usage is not really classical, since his epithets are not, in fact, fixed: they vary, and they are not always used where, by classical standards, they would be expected. Fet's usage is even further removed from classical norms, since his epithets are heavily determined by context: the availability of space in the line and the semantics of the immediately surrounding text.

These adjustments are important not for their informational value, but rhetorically. For example, the small-town innkeeper expresses his satisfaction with himself, his wife, the place where he lives and owns property, and most expansively of all, the property itself, specifically his new carriage. His smug evaluations would be comic even without pseudo-classical epithets, but the epithets contribute to the portrait of a speaker teetering unselfconsciously between stately neoclassical dignity and petty-bourgeois silliness. Thus, in an expression of worthy nostalgia for what is lost, the innkeeper refers to the land from which refugees are now streaming as *das übergheinische Land, das schöne* (1, 10), but ends his speech with a bump of anticlimax when he uses a syntactically parallel construction to talk about his new carriage: *das Kütschchen ... , das neue* (1, 8–18):

*Möcht ich mich doch nicht rühren vom Platz, um zu sehen das Elend
 Guter fliehender Menschen, die nun, mit geretteter Habe
 Leider das übergelassene Land, das schöne, verlassend,
 Zu uns herüberkommen und durch den glücklichen Winkel
 Dieses fruchtbaren Tals und seiner Krümmungen wandern.
 Trefflich hast du gehandelt, o Frau, daß du milde den Sohn fort
 Schicktest, mit altem Linnen und etwas Essen und Trinken,
 Um es den Armen zu spenden; denn Geben ist Sache des Reichen.
 Was der Junge doch fährt! und wie er bändigt die Hengste!
 Sehr gut nimmt das Kütschchen sich aus, das neue; bequemlich
 Säßen Viere darin und auf dem Bocke der Kutscher.*

[I wouldn't want to move from my place in order to see the suffering of the good people fleeing, who now, alas, leaving the land, the beautiful, on the far side of the Rhine, with the goods they have saved, journey this way, to us and through the happy corner of this fruitful valley and its meanderings. You have done a fine thing, wife, in kindly sending out our son, with old linen and something to eat and drink, to distribute it to the poor; for giving is the business of the rich man. The youngster really drives well! and how he controls the steeds! The coach, the new, looks very good; four people could sit in it comfortably, and a coachman on the coach-box.]

Neither the lands west of the Rhine nor the carriage are dignified with epithets in Russian:

*Право, – с места не тронусь затем, чтобы видеть несчастье
 Добрых бегущих людей с уцелевшим имением. Несчастливым
 Чуждые страны за Рейном оставить пришлось и, на нашу
 Землю ступая, захватить уголок безмятежно счастливый
 Этой обильной долины, следя за ее направленьем...
 Ты поступила прекрасно, жена, что, из жалости, сына
 К бедным с холстиною старой, с питьем отпустила и пищей
 Для раздачи, затем, что давать – есть дело богатых.
 Малый-то как покотил! Да как жеребцами он правит!
 Право, повозочка новая очень красива, удобно
 В ней четверым поместиться и кучеру место на козлах.*

[Really, I won't budge from the spot in order to see the misfortune of good people fleeing with their surviving possessions. The unfortunates have had to leave the wonderful lands over the Rhine and, coming onto our land, to seize a peacefully happy corner of this abundant valley, following where it leads ... You have done superbly, wife, that out of pity you sent our son to the poor people with old clothes, with food and drink to distribute, for giving is a thing for the rich. And how that chap drove off! And how he handles the stallions! Really, our new coach is very handsome, it seats four comfortably and room for a coachman on the coach-box.]

2.3. Pronominal forms: first and second person pronouns, plurals, and possessives

Personal pronouns and possessive adjectives, like epithets, occur in contexts where they may seem redundant, and Fet treats them similarly, permitting them to come and go as versification requires. The two lines (9, 262–63) quoted above contain not only (*друг*) *мой* but also (*кажется*) *мне*: neither has much informational value, and neither is present in German. The personalization of the fiancé’s speech, and its narrowing of perspective, is also reflected in several mentions of ‘us’ and ‘ours’ that are lacking in German. Goethe has the fiancé state (9, 262–63):

Ich verlasse dich hier; und wo ich jemals dich wieder

Finde – wer weiß es? Vielleicht sind diese Gespräche die letzten.

[I leave you here; and where I ever again will find you – who knows? Perhaps this is our last conversation.]

Fet, as in our previous examples, retains the metrical structure, albeit without the enjambment:

Здесь я тебя покидаю; а где мы снова сойдемся –

Кто может знать? Разговор наш может быть и последним.

[Here I leave you; and where we shall meet anew – who can tell? Our conversation may be also our last.]

The caesuras within the third foot of the first line and in the second foot of the second line are both in place, and the core meaning of the lines is also preserved, but, again, the speaker personalizes and links himself with Dorothea in occurrences of *мы* and *наш* lacking in German: whereas Goethe’s line is divided into “I leave you here” ~ “where [will] I ever again (find) you?”, with parallel “I” and “thou” in each hemistich, Fet’s line renders the opposition as “I leave you here” ~ “where will we come together again?”, which is also pathetic but more attuned to reunion, the coming together of “I” and “thou”. The delay of *finde* until the next line in Goethe’s text defers the reunion iconically, and the difference between the stretching out in time of *jemals* can be compared with the happy resolution implicit in *снова*. As in our previous example, some fine details of Goethe’s text are changed, but Fet nonetheless captures a solid core of textual meaning and expresses it within metrical constraints even narrower

than just those of the 6-foot line; the poignancy of separation is even expressed versificationally, through the strong syntactic division of the caesura.

The lovers' ultimate reunion is expressed in Goethe's text, only a few lines later, precisely in the terms of 'our' finding each other that Fet used to translate the opening of the speech (9, 275–78):

*Du bewahrst mir dein Herz; und finden dereinst wir uns wieder
Über den Trümmern der Welt, so sind wir erneute Geschöpfe,
Umgebildet und frei und unabhängig vom Schicksal.
Denn was fesselte den, der solche Tage durchlebt hat!*

[You keep your heart for me, and should we once again find each other beyond the rubble of the world, then will we be renewed creatures, transformed and free and independent of fate. For what would bind him who has lived through such days!]

Fet repeats his earlier vocabulary:

*Сердце свое ты храни для меня и, если сойдемся
Мы на развалинах мира, тогда обновленными будем
Существами, которым судьба не предпишет закона.
Может ли что оковать пережившего наши утраты?*

[You keep your heart for me and if we come together on the ruins of the world, then we shall be renewed beings, for whom fate will not prescribe a law. Can anything bind one who has lived through our losses?]

Again, the Russian lines convey the core of Goethe's lexical and metrical values, although the resonance, and the rhetoric, is changed. The experience of 'such days' in Goethe's text becomes 'our losses' in Fet's. Fet's speaker, more than Goethe's, personalizes and specifies the lovers' hypothetical future retrospection. This personalization is enhanced by Fet's tag possessor 'our' attached to the losses.

The effect of the changes Fet makes is felt much less on the level of the local domain than it is in the broader context of the whole poem. The semantic value of the personal-possessive 'ours' is greatest in the scenes, including the fiancé's speech, at the end of *Hermann und Dorothea*. The 'ours' that promises to associate Dorothea with the deceased fiancé who is quoted addressing her is in some tension with the possessive 'our' that will be used in the next speech, by Dorothea's present fiancé, Hermann. The culmination of the poem, after all, is the betrothal of Hermann and Dorothea, and the poem closes on Hermann's speech, in which he states that "*Dies ist unser!*", referring to the German

national way of life and to German lands, and he proudly proclaims that, now that he has possession of Dorothea, the things that are his own are more his own than ever. In the German final canto of the poem, this is the first time the possessive *unser* occurs, and its whole meaning is focused in its national values. The rhetoric of possession in the German text is thus exploited to create a strong closing speech. At the same time, Goethe's text opposes possession (and consequent resistance to incursion) to movement (including revolutionary movements and expansionist military ones). In Fet's text, in contrast, the Russian possessive *наш* occurs nine times, but the effect is not to make the word more emphatic than in the German text, but more diffuse. Both the deceased fiancé and Hermann uses the possessive repeatedly in contexts where it lacks a direct German counterpart and is not really necessary in Russian. Fet's text emphasizes, as Goethe's does not, each speaker's appeal to Dorothea as to someone sharing his experience, and their Russian speech feels much more than the German one like a declaration involving romantic lovers. Possessive *наш* binds Dorothea to her deceased fiancé, even as he is explicitly leaving her behind, and through him it associates her also with the other dispossessed Germans, as well as with Hermann.

2.4. Clichés based on autosemantic lexical items: love, life, and loss

The differences between Fet's *Hermann und Dorothea* and the German original derive not only from the work's having been translated into Russian, but also from the time at which the translation was made: Fet's reading of *Hermann und Dorothea* was similar to that of many contemporary German readers, for whom the text was a story of love and marriage in the context of a rising nationalist sentiment. Whatever the cause, from a modern reader's perspective, the deceased fiancé in Fet's text appears to be less other-worldly than in German and more like one of Fet's own lyric speakers of the 1840s. Where Goethe's hero is amazed at what is going on in the world, Fet's is sorrowfully concerned with his personal situation. In line 278, quoted above, we noted that Fet replaces 'such days' with 'our losses'. The difference is not only in Fet's use of the possessive pronoun, but also in his introducing 'loss', a notion inherently more personal than the notion of 'days': 'days' are an incontrovertible reality and need not have any specific value; in contrast, losses, however real, have first of all to be experienced and valued by someone as such. The semantics of loss

are further elaborated as the fiancé's speech continues. Goethe has the fiancé warn Dorothea against undue attachments, and of the redoubled pain that lurks should Dorothea suffer yet further loss. Most dramatically, however, he warns her against excessive attachment to life itself (9, 283–89):

*Locket neue Wohnung dich an und neue Verbindung,
So genieße mit Dank, was dann dir das Schicksal bereitet.
Liebe die Liebenden rein und halte dem Guten dich dankbar.
Aber dann auch setze nur leicht den beweglichen Fuß auf;
Denn es lauert der doppelte Schmerz des neuen Verlustes.
Heilig sei dir der Tag; doch schätze das Leben nicht höher
Als ein anderes Gut, und alle Güter sind trüglich.“*

[Should a new dwelling and new ties attract you, then enjoy with thanks what then Fate has made ready for you. Love purely those who love and stay ever grateful to one who is good. But then too step lightly with moving foot, for the redoubled sorrow of new loss is lurking. The day be sacrosanct for you, yet prize life no higher than another possession, and all possessions are delusory.]

Fet's speaker issues the same warning:

*Если тебя привлекут иное жилище и связи,
Будь благодарна судьбе за то, что она посылает,
Добрым добром воздавай, а любящим – чистой любовью,
Но, повсюду в дорогу готовая легкой стопюю,
Чтоб в глубокое горе / не впасть / вторичной утраты,
Каждым днем дорожи; / но жизнь не выше другого
Блага считай и цени, – обманчиво каждое благо».*

[If another dwelling and ties attract you, be grateful to fate for what it sends you, reciprocate with good to the good, and to those who are loving, with pure love, but everywhere ready for the road with light step, so as not to fall into the deep sorrow of a second loss, treasure each day; but count and value life no more highly than another good, – every good is deceptive.]

Here, however, Dorothea is urged not to beware the redoubled pain that lurks should she suffer new loss, but rather to beware of falling into the deep woe of a *second* loss – as if Dorothea, who has lost everything, including her home, her place in society, and apparently considerable possessions, has in fact suffered no loss except the loss of the speaker. The danger foreseen is less undue attachment to life than imprudent infatuation.

Fet's translation thus recasts, or re-shades, the semantic details of the German text. The lexical material involved is generally of low informational value, as with the epithets or when the German text lacks a pronominal form corresponding to one that appears in Russian. However, semantic adjustments can also affect nouns and other autosemantic words even when they are not strictly redundant. Usually such words are, however, semantically weak, because they refer to notions stereotypical in romantic poetry (loss, life, and love). Fet clearly treats these words as less important than certain other, pivotal, elements of the lines he was translating.

3. Translating in larger domains. Connotation. Semantic shifts

The slight adjustments of meaning discussed so far generally affect words of little informational value. Although the changes vary in importance (the difference between 'Will I ever find you again?' and 'Will we ever meet again?', on one hand, would seem to be smaller than that between 'our losses' and 'such days', on the other), the effect of changes is generally slight, but they are always at least detectable on the level of the local domain. We now turn to changes that are different in several respects. To differentiate them consistently from the mismatches discussed above, we will refer to the changes discussed below not as mismatches, but as shifts.

The most obvious difference, compared with the mismatches already discussed, is that shifts arise in the translation of words that are indubitably important, even key words, as they are used in the original poem. Thus, in comparing the translated and original poems, we will discuss the shifts differentiating their vocabulary of renewal, important both for the marriage-and-family theme in the poem, and for its social and revolutionary-political themes. Also discussed will be the shifts from Goethe's to Fet's lexicon of ruin and their 'heart' vocabulary. Like the notion of renewal, the notions of ruin and heart are also important in this poem about love, marriage, family, and community.

In addition to the importance of the words affected, the shifts discussed below are also distinguished by their being mainly, although not entirely, connotative, and by the fact that they affect a different domain from the changes discussed above. In the local domain, shifts usually do not constitute

(denotative) mismatches, since the words of the German text are replaced by impeccable Russian equivalents. The words that are 'shifted' are all repeated in the original text and are denotatively well matched at each corresponding point in the translation. The shift is evoked, in such cases, not by mismatches, but by a superfluity of matches, as a single German (repeated) word is matched against multiple (different) words in Russian. Some connotative shift arguably occurs at each point where the "matched" word occurs, but the value of the change is small. Connotative value in Goethe's text, however, is not stable across the text, but rather is created by a process of cumulation. At each repetition, the connotative power of the repeated word grows for readers of the original poem, and the connotative loss to the reader of the translation becomes correspondingly greater. Because the shift in values takes place across the domain of the whole text, it radically affects textual coherence, and the effect is asymmetrical, felt more at the end of the text than at the beginning.

The words that participate in semantic shifts in translation are not to be identified with only their notional value. For example, although the notion of ruin, as noted above, is important for the original text, what is "key" is not the general notion but one specific word, namely *Trümmer*, that expresses it. It is not the case that Goethe's text builds notionally, such that all words expressing, in this instance, ruin or related notions are embedded directly into a large textual domain that is appropriately translated by a Russian text that similarly embeds the corresponding notions. If that were so, then, for example, the deceased fiancé could equally well refer to 'our losses' (as he does in Fet's translation) as to 'these days' (as he does in Goethe's). Fet's introducing 'our losses' does indeed capture an important reality of the original poetic world, namely that its inhabitants have experienced losses (ruin). The introduction of the notion of 'losses' in the translation, however, constitutes a Fetian approximation to Goethe's much more pointed use of a single word, *Trümmer*, which occurs within a few lines in the same speech, but not in the same immediate domain and not at all with the same connotative force. Goethe's text, however powerful its ideas and driving rhetoric, is based on precise control of specific words, including both their denotative and connotative values and their local and broader semantic resonance. In dealing with such a fine degree of lexical control, no translator can compete, because no translator enjoys the original poet's freedom of word choice. As an original poet, Fet was not particularly oriented toward exploiting the denotative potential of words, and as a translator he was bound by a different poet's choices.

3.1. Fet's theory and practice of translation

Since we have emphasized Fet's craft in translating within small domains, and the problems we will deal with here are mainly evident in broader ones, it might seem that Fet's particular gift as a translator was not suited to the challenges of the text he was translating. The problem, however, is not with Fet, although it may be connected with his native German-Russian bilingualism. It is sometimes suggested that native or near-native bilinguals are at a disadvantage as translators, or at least tend to produce work that other readers find unsuccessful even, or especially, when their translations display perfect linguistic knowledge and erudition; consider, for example, the controversy surrounding Nabokov's English *Eugene Onegin*. Critics sometimes attribute the problem to an individual translator's personal idiosyncrasies, but the material points elsewhere, namely to the language- and culture-specific nature of lexical connotation as experienced by a bilingual, in this case Fet.

Fet's explanations of why he translated as he did make sense in a bilingual context. Criticized for the style of one of his translations of a short poem by Goethe, Fet stated that he had translated the poem as he had because that was what the poem meant (LN 626). A German text, as Fet evidently saw it, expressed a meaning that it was the translator's job to express in Russian. It was not up to the translator to express or withhold meaning, depending on his judgments either about Russian readers' associations with words that were semantically well chosen to match the original, or about their inability to make associations that were available to German-speakers reading the original text. The translation was not a work of art but a vehicle for bringing an alien treasure into the house of someone other than its creator – in the poet's expression, a "rug" that was laid down to help move the poem into its new house. Fet's views on translation are well known and have usually been considered idiosyncratic, but they may be understood also as a consequence of his being both a native bilingual and a professional writer. On one hand, he could express what he meant equally well in either German or Russian, and, on the other, he did not consider any expression in either language fully equivalent to a paraphrase even in the same language. Thus, even in the same language, there could be no full equivalency between texts, but meanings could be expressed in one language as well as in another. The result for Fet seems to have been some tendency to associate any one expression in German with exactly one expression in Russian: if he meant to say in Russian what Goethe had said in German, then the Russian expression with that meaning would be fairly precisely what he,

Fet, wrote, within the limits imposed by versificational demands and the connotative differences of the vocabulary of the two languages.

Readers today often value literary works in translation without even thinking about the relationship of the translation to the original, and this interlingual and cross-cultural floating of literary text enables us to value work in far more languages than we can possibly read, much less know well. Because of our multicultural aspirations, we want our translations to read as though we could imagine writing them, if only we were writers, ourselves. Fet's orientation was different: he aimed to transmit to his readers what could be transplanted, as he put it, to the alien Russian soil – but he never pretended that the exotic transplant in its hothouse could be mistaken for the plant in its natural setting. Below, we explore Fet's linguistic horticulture.

3.2. The composition of *Hermann und Dorothea*

In our discussion above, the illustrations come mainly from the closing scenes in the last of the nine cantos of *Hermann und Dorothea*. This is the section of the poem characterized by the most elevated speech (the poem is spoken by the characters in it, along with a narrator) and by dramatic revelation. The composition is famous for its neoclassical beauty of form, both its clarity and its delicacy of shading. It relies heavily for its effect on clear binary and ternary internal divisions, which model Goethe's notions of *Polarität* (polarity) and *Steigerung* (climax).³ Binary aspects of the composition promote large-scale antithesis, while ternary division of the cantos (3+3+3) promotes broadly based gradation, marked by a progressive elevation of register. The first third of the poem is domestic comedy, the highest register in the second third is attained in two educated speakers' general discussion of ordinary people's behaviour in terrible times, while the end of the poem moves beyond those times, culminating in an ill-fated prophecy of an age in which people will be transformed, and finally in a marriage that is both rich in mystical and national symbolism as well as transformative of the participants.

³ Beyond their general meanings, *Polarität* and *Steigerung* are technical terms that Goethe develops in his natural-science writings. *Hermann und Dorothea* is connected to Goethe's natural-science writing, especially his *Farbenlehre*, by the opening lines of Canto 7, which consist of an extended simile that summarizes some of Goethe's observations about colour and light perception.

The compositional clarity of the poem reinforces connections among even widely separated words, and is supported by tightly controlled lexical repetition and by an accumulation of semantic value. Thus, connotative resonance, especially of words that are repeated in key passages, is a significant tool in the creation of semantic value in the domain of the text overall. The connotations, however, reside in the cultural-historical tradition, even the etymologies, underlying the key words. Obviously, these aspects of German vocabulary are language-specific and resist translation.

3.3. The fiancé's speech revisited: renewal and newness

The fiancé's speech is well known for its passion and intensity, and it has been noted in the literature that his qualities and the values he represents are expressed in his choice of words (Morgan 1984). Some of his characteristic vocabulary is unique to him, in the context of the poem (e.g. *Geschöpfe* 'creatures' and *umgebildet* 're-formed', at lines 9, 276–77), and associate him with a specific chiliastic political and religious line in the German cultural life of the day. More of his vocabulary, however, is shared with other speakers, but is used by him in a more exalted meaning. For convenience, we quote again four lines introduced above (9, 275–78):

*Du bewahrst mir dein Herz; und finden dereinst wir uns wieder
Über den Trümmern der Welt, so sind wir erneute Geschöpfe,
Umgebildet und frei und unabhängig vom Schicksal.
Denn was fesselte den, der solche Tage durchlebt hat!*

Here, the form *erneute* 'renewed' gains its dignity not only from its collocation with the uniquely-occurring *Geschöpfe* but also by its contrast, in this context, with earlier uses: the notion of renewal was applied to comic effect in the first third of the poem and then, in the middle of the text (5, 212), occurs in a passage, spoken by the town pastor, evoking Psalm 104 (verses 19–32).

In the first, domestic, third of the poem, *erneute* and other forms of *erneuen* ~ *erneuern* occur in Cantos 1 and 3, where the words are associated with provincial smugness and envy, and attachment to petty orderliness. Thus, forms of *erneuen* occur when the town innkeeper admires a neighbour's renovated property (1, 55), and he and another neighbour rather stupidly agree on the need to maintain public areas properly (3, 7), following the

example of foreigners (who happen, at the moment, to be pillaging German properties nearby):

Denn was wäre das Haus, was wäre die Stadt, wenn nicht immer

Jeder gedachte mit Lust zu erhalten und zu erneuen

Und zu verbessern auch, wie die Zeit uns lehrt und das Ausland!

[For what would the house be, what would the town be, if everyone were not always thinking happily about maintaining and renovating and improving, too, as the time teaches us, and foreign countries!]

In Fet's version:

Что же бы с домом случилось и с городом, если бы каждый

Не старался поддерживать, возобновлять, что имеет,

И украшать в духе времени, по заграничным примерам?

[What would become of the house and the town, if everyone weren't trying to keep it up what he has, to renovate and adorn it in the spirit of the time, according to foreign examples?]

The platitudinous innkeeper also uses the same verb to exhort his guests to put aside sad thoughts of the train of refugees recently passing by the town (*Aber laßt uns nicht mehr die traurigen Bilder erneuern* [But let us no longer renew the sad images] – in Fet's version, *Но не станем печальных картин обновлять перед нами.* – 1, 157) – a classically inspired expression, turned silly in the mouth of the innkeeper, who has not witnessed or wanted to witness the passage of the refugees (and so was hardly renewing sorrowful images of them) and has just said that “we” sent Hermann to help them (when it was his wife's initiative) only in order to feel less guilty about not wanting to have to look at them (which may well have been his motivation, but was probably not his wife's).

In the middle of the poem, in its medium register, *erneuern* returns when the ever-moderate pastor describes how the earth renews (*erneuert*) its gifts with the years and months (5, 210–13):

... wenn das Volk in glücklichen Tagen dahinlebt,

Von der Erde sich nährend, die weit und breite sich auf tut

Und die erwünschten Gaben in Jahren und Monden erneuert,

Da geht alles von selbst ...

[... when the people in happy days live well, nourishing themselves from the earth, which opens itself up expansively and renews the wished-for gifts with the years and months, then everything goes along by itself ...]

The gradation in values associated with renewal follows the rising rhetorical trajectory of the poem overall. Canto 5 also marks the mid-point in a progression in the use of sacred texts. In the first third of the poem, *erneuern* has no reference to sacred texts, while the last reference to renewal, to people made new, evokes the Christian Bible (e.g. Romans 12.2, II Corinthians 4.16, Colossians 3.10). The reference to renewal in Canto 5 is neither without a basis in sacred text nor plainly grounded in the Christian chiliastic vision of the deceased fiancé; rather, it points to a Jewish text, and partly veils the meaning. Goethe's rhetoric thus appeals to well-known Christian ideology, ordered along a rising trajectory.

In Fet's version, the corresponding text reads as follows:

... Покаместь народ проживает тихонько
В счастье, питаясь плодами земли, дары приносящей
С каждым временем года и с каждой новой луною,
Все в то время само собою приходит ...

[... When the people live quietly in good fortune, feeding on the fruits of the earth, bringing gifts with each season of the year and with every new moon, at that time everything comes of itself]

Here, we see an interesting shift with rhetorical consequences for the whole poem, but also exhibiting a partial denotative loss (mismatch) in the local domain. As shown above, in Cantos 1, 3, and 9 Fet translates *erneuern/erneuen* with forms of *обновить ~ обновлен*, a verb that is directly comparable, even morphologically. In Canto 5, however, the verb *erneuert* 'renews' is replaced by the adjective *neu* 'new', which modifies not the earth (which does the renewing in Goethe's text) but the moon. At this point, Fet is drawing on a technique noted above, when he turned an epithet into an adverb of comparable meaning: in the present instance he translates, not a particular word (*erneuert*), but the core of its meaning (here, newness) and locates it not exactly according to the hierarchical structure of the original text but, in linear or spatial terms, quite nearby (*Monden erneuert ~ новой луною*). Fet's translation keeps an important part of the semantics and reads smoothly, but eliminates the idea of renewal from the middle ground of the poem. Even if newness is the core of

renewal, still, the notion crucial to the meaning of the poem is not newness itself, but the state of having been made new, against an implied background of oldness and change. The naïve innkeeper admires the newness of the renovated home of his wealthy neighbour and the good order of public works in his town, but his wife reminds him of the catastrophic fire that had destroyed much of the town, brought back into being through the determination of its people. Discussing newness and change, Goethe's text moves from human agency and will to renew, then, in the middle of the poem, to a natural agency in which renewal is a gift of the earth, and finally to the realm of fate in a post-natural universe. Fet's text does not insist, as Goethe's does, on drawing this line, from well-kept-up public works to the renewed creatures of a post-Revolutionary world.

3.4. Catastrophe and ruin

The notion of renewal is intimately connected, at least in *Hermann und Dorothea*, with the need for renewal and the catastrophe that inspires people to renew. Just as the fiancé's speech offers an elevation of earlier mentions of renovation, similarly we find there a similar rhetoric associated with the notion of catastrophe, specifically in the phrase *über den Trümmern der Welt*, literally 'across the rubble of the world' (9, 276). The words echo those of Hermann's mother as she recalls how she clambered over rubble after the fire in the town (2, 132). The rubble she speaks of first is of a specific house, her own, after which she uses the same word again, when she praises her son for thinking to court a bride during the difficulties of wartime (*zu frein im Krieg und über den Trümmern* 'to go courting in war and across the rubble' – 2, 157). This time the rubble is real but not specific. The third time the word occurs, in the fiancé's speech, *Trümmer* takes in ruined houses and the ruin of a world order. In each successive occurrence, reference is less specific and register heightened. The word is linked each time to catastrophe, which gradually expands from one girl's home to the whole world. The moral of the mother's story is that catastrophe can lead to something positive, as did the fire that led to her marriage and family happiness. She uses the word again, in a slightly less concrete and more elevated way, as she looks to her son to continue the family's good fortune. While this is hardly the eschatological vision of Canto 9, it establishes a natural and consistent link between rubble and catastrophe, and between catastrophe and hope for a better hereafter. It also shows a word gaining in rhetorical power as it is repeated.

The appearance of *Trümmer* in these different contexts rests on a long history, in which the word is associated with something being left at (or as) an end (DW 22, 1338–1339). *Trümmer* is used in the Luther Bible only with reference to final catastrophic disintegration of everything, or of mothers and their children dashed to pieces (Hosea 10.14). It is related to the English *thrum*, which is what is left on the loom when the cloth is finally cut away. According to Jakob and Wilhelm Grimm (DW 22, 1343–44), the implication of *Trümmer* is generally of something big or important that has been ruined or reduced to fragments, and Goethe, like his contemporaries, uses the word in geological as well as architectural descriptions (Adelung 4, 708–09; DW 22, 1338; Fischer 1929: 633–634). The word seems to have no associations with ruin as gradual decline, but rather has enjoyed a rich tradition of symbolic or metaphorical use in phrases referring to the rubble of the world, or even of the sun (DW 22, 1343, quoting Lavater).⁴ Goethe's use of the phrase *Trümmer der Welt* specifically echoes its occurrence in Schiller's early poem "Der Eroberer" (1777).

The Russian text (quoted above) cannot match the German rhetoric, because the words involved are connotatively too different. There is no problem with the translation of the phrase in Canto 9: the phrase *развалины мира* 'rubble of the world' would seem to be entirely adequate. The difficulty for the Russian translator is that rubble is not necessarily associated with catastrophe, and *развалины* need not be catastrophic in origin. This not only makes the word less forceful in the speech of the fiancé but also makes it useable, and even necessary, in other contexts, not always ones in which *Trümmer* would be expected in German. Unlike German *Trümmer*, Russian *развалины* has predominantly architectural associations: what can be reduced to *развалины* in the most ordinary usage is a building or a place with buildings or construction of some sort. Even morphologically and etymologically, *развалины* means the pieces of something that has fallen apart; it need have nothing to do with a catastrophic end, and may well represent the result of a gradual process (for example, in referring to a person whose appearance has been ravaged by time or illness).

⁴ Examples include "Ja, sollte schon die Welt zu tausend Trümmern gehn" (Opitz, cited in Adelung 4, 709).

Correspondingly, Fet's *развалины* occurs in the contexts where *Trümmer* appears in Goethe's text, but also in a different one, in Canto 3, where the German word never appears and the connection of the Russian one is with gradual ruin, the literal falling apart that the form of the word suggests. In this passage, Hermann's father, the innkeeper, is nattering on about striving and improving (3, 14–18):

*Denn wo die Türme verfallen und Mauern, wo in den Gräben
Unrat sich häufet und Unrat auf allen Gassen herumliegt,
... der Ort ist übel regieret.*

[For where the towers and the walls are decrepit, where trash piles up in the gutters and there is trash lying around all over the streets ... the place is badly run.]

In Russian translation the passage reads:

*Там, где башни и стены в развалинах, где по канavam
Сор накопился и сор по улицам всюду разбросан,
Там, где тронулся камень с места и вновь не задвинул,
Где перегнило бревно и дом вотице ожидает
Новой опоры, – понятно, что там управленья худое;*

[Where the towers and walls are in ruins, where trash has piled up along the gutters and there is trash thrown all around the streets, where the stone has got out of place and is not put back, where a beam has rotted through and a building waits in vain for new support – of course, it's bad management there.]

The *развалины* here are not catastrophic: the walls of the town are in bad shape, but they have not necessarily been destroyed beyond repair. Fet's use of *развалины* as 'rubble' is not only fully justified semantically but is also especially resourceful because it partly captures the phonetic shape of *verfallen*.

The rhetoric of Fet's *развалины* is thus different from that of Goethe's *Trümmer*. The Russian word jumps from the comic bluster of the innkeeper's speech in Canto 3 to the ethereal passions of Canto 9; the German text, in contrast, suggests a more immediate parallel, with no comic overtones, between the effect of the fire on the town and the effect of the revolution on the nation. The coherence of the repeated mentions of building and re-building is somewhat lessened in Russian, because of the difference in vocabulary. At the same time, lacking in Russian a word that would fit Goethe's large-scale

rhetorical structure, Fet displays an acute awareness of more localized German-Russian connections, in the felicitous lexical and phonic match of *развалины* and *verfallen* in Canto 3.

3.5. The language of the heart

The use of *Trümmer* and *развалины* illustrates the difficulty of translating emotionally charged words with language-specific histories and connotations. Since *Trümmer* and *развалины* are relatively uncommon words, each occurrence tends to evoke previous ones, and their appearance serves as a kind of rhetorical accent. A different challenge is presented by common words that, for all their frequency, are nonetheless not emptied of value but still function as potential key words in the semantic organization of the text. The word *Herz* ‘heart’ is such a word. It plays a significant role in the speech of the deceased fiancé but is also frequent elsewhere – 41 times in Goethe’s text. In Fet’s translation the corresponding *сердце* occurs 52 times. The word for ‘heart’ thus qualifies as a frequently used word in both texts; the issue, however, is not its exact frequency in one text or the other, but rather the connotative difference between the ‘heart’ words in the two texts.

The semantic profile of the 3600 occurrences of ‘heart’ in Goethe’s work is well studied (GWB 4, 1079–91). Goethe’s *Herz* usually refers to psychological states having the heart as their domain. Although words such as *Gemüt* and *Seele* are often synonymous with *Herz*, the word *Herz* predominates in Goethe because of its currency in contemporary German, influenced by a Pietist tradition traceable to the 1690 work *La théologie du coeur* by Pierre Poiret (Atwood 2004: 43), and thence to 17th-century French religious discourse. The heart is thus associated with religious, ethical, and moral experience, and also evokes individual impulse and human capacities for action. Goethe’s usage is broadly consistent, but its semantic orientation evolves. *Hermann und Dorothea* marks a stage in which the semantics of the heart are oriented toward moral qualities, in particular the individual’s intuitive moral rectitude, functioning in harmony with social order. This does not exclude the occurrence of *Herz* in other meanings, and in *Hermann und Dorothea* the word *Herz* also symbolizes (inter-) personal relationships, including erotic ones. Thus, *Herz* has connotations appropriate to each of the two main thematic lines in the poem – the story of love and marriage, but also the story of social upheaval, transformation, and continuity. In the poem, *Herz* is used in both

senses. Because the plot is first and foremost a marriage story, culminating in a dramatic and ideologically fraught betrothal scene, the double value of the word *Herz* sanctions its use to articulate the relationships between the personal love-and-marriage theme and the social theme. Repeated use of this common word throughout the poem thus offers opportunity for word play and contemplation of the relationships between personal life stories and their social and ethical situation.

In Russian translation, heart rhetoric cannot function exactly the same way, because the lexical tradition behind the word *сердце* participates less immediately in the Pietist tradition. For Fet, the heart was the seat of erotic passion; the moral and social impulse dominant in the *Herz* of *Hermann und Dorothea* was never dominant in Fet's own heart semantics. During the early to middle 1840's, when Fet was strongly influenced by Goethe's work, Fet's *сердце* in his original poetry sometimes seems closer to Goethe's *Herz*, for example, in his early poem beginning "Я люблю многое, близкое сердцу ..." [There is much that I love that is close to my heart], but this was a semantic Germanism and fell away along with the formal Germanisms for which his early poetry was criticized.

The complexity of Goethe's heart semantics is evident, especially, when we consider passages in which the metaphorical values of the heart are made explicit, and we can see that Fet is able to capture some of these values more fully than others. For example, as we might expect, the pastor in the poem has different heart-associations from the judge whom he encounters and discusses politics with in Cantos 5 and 6. The pastor concerns himself with the heart as the domain of a love that has been left to wither (5, 73–74), and Fet uses *сердце* to translate the passage with his usual accuracy. In contrast, although the judge speaks of the heart as a domain, it is in his usage a locus not for a captive Eros but for morally or ethically maleficent energies; he describes as follows the desperation of those who have lost everything (6, 480):

*Dann ist sein Gemüt auch erhitzt, und es kehrt die Verzweiflung
Aus dem Herzen hervor das frevelhafte Beginnen*

[Then is his nature aroused, and desperation sweeps sinful deeds hither from out of his heart].

Fet's Russian version of the judge's lines captures the idea that the heart is the domain of a personified desperation:

*Кроме того он взволнован. Отчаянье в сердце теснится
И понуждает его на всякий злодейский поступок.*

[Besides, he is aroused. Desperation lies cramped in his heart and impels him to any sort of evil deed.]

It also follows the original in that desperation is closely confined and so liable to break out. What the Russian lacks is the image of desperation energetically sweeping, house cleaning, as it were, to find all the bad things that might be lying around. Evil, like political idealism, seems less energetic in Fet's translation than in Goethe's original, and the rhetoric is less fully sustained.

A similar contrast is presented by two extended passages in which love is masked: characters refer to moral qualities of heart when their concerns are really erotic, and as a result, their language is communicatively devalued as "only words ... to hide [their] feelings" (*Worte waren es nur, die ich sprach; sie sollten vor Euch nur / Meine Gefühle verstecken* – 4, 140–41). In one such passage, in Canto 8, Fet's translation renders Goethe's *Herz* consistently; in the other, in Canto 4, it does not.

In Canto 8, Hermann is bringing Dorothea home to his family, but has not told her he wants to marry her; instead, he has offered her a job as a maid. Dorothea is cautiously flirtatious and Hermann is bumbling and teasing. From a distance, for example, he points out the window of his bedroom and says that maybe she will end up sleeping there; he adds: "we're re-modeling" (8, 74). She asks him to describe his family so that she can do a good job for them, and Hermann describes his father's liking for the formalities. Dorothea explains she has grown up with that sort of thing and that she will just do what comes naturally, what comes "from the heart": *Was von Herzen mir geht – ich will es dem Alten erzeugen* (8, 49), a turn of phrase that evokes the Biblical saying that "from the abundance of the heart the lips speak" (Matthew 12,34; Luke 6,45). But who, she wants to know, is going to advise her about what Hermann wants? He says: *Lass dein Herz dir es sagen und folg ihm frei nur in allem* [Let your heart guide you and just follow it freely in everything] (8, 62). The answer takes up Dorothea's earlier words but, coming from the lovelorn Hermann, suggests he might be thinking of making his pitch. But not so fast: *Aber er wagte kein weiteres Wort, so sehr auch die Stunde / Günstig war; er fürchtete, nur ein Nein zu ereilen* [But he braved no further word, regardless of how opportune the

hour, he feared to elicit only a 'no']. Finally, Dorothea trips and falls against Hermann (8, 96–98),

*Und so fühlt' er die herrliche Last, die Wärme des Herzens,
Und den Balsam des Atems, an seinen Lippen verhauchtet,
Trug mit Mannesgefühl die Heldengröße des Weibes*

[And so he felt the splendid burden, the warmth of the heart, and the balsam of the breath, breathed on his, he bore with manly feeling the woman's heroic size].

The word *Herz* thus helps bring the dialogue to its natural close, in the wordless communication that emanates in breath from out of the warmth of Dorothea's heart.

In Fet's version of Canto 8, each occurrence of *Herz* is matched by an occurrence of *сердце*, and Fet even sharpens the Biblical allusion in Dorothea's speech: *Всем, чем сердце полно, старику угождать я готова* [I am prepared to try to please the old man with everything with which my heart is full]. The exactness of the match is what we would expect in passages where corresponding vocabulary is available and words are being used in meanings congenial to the translator: he knew the Biblical allusion, and he knew 'heart' as the symbol of erotic love.

No such one-to-one match is found in Canto 4, where the erotic symbolism of the heart is less salient. In Canto 4, as in Canto 8, Hermann is stifling the expression of his love, and, as in Canto 8, different connotations of *Herz* come into play. This time however, there is no hint of flirtation. Instead, *Herz* is associated with motherly love, moral intuition, and human impulse. Hermann's mother has discovered him crying and asks what has oppressed his heart: *Sag, was beklemmt dir das Herz?* (4, 69). He responds by speaking of his heart as a repository of noble feelings and source of morally driven action. As an only son, he has been exempted from military service, but now he sees that he should serve. What he saw in carrying out his errand, he admits ambiguously, has touched his heart (4, 72–76):

*Wahrlich, dem ist kein Herz im ehernen Busen, der jetzo
Nicht die Not der Menschen, der umgetriebnen, empfindet [...]]
Was ich heute gesehn und gehört, das rührte das Herz mir*

[Truly, he has no heart in his iron bosom who does not now sympathize with the need of those people, pushed about. ... What I have seen and heard today has touched my heart]

He begins to falter as he describes standing in the family's orchard and seeing the trees bent over by the weight of their fruit, the promise of a rich harvest. He describes the beautiful scene in terms of his personal feelings, and yet he claims to respond to this beauty by thinking (4, 81): *Aber, ach! wie nah ist der Feind!* [But oh! how near is the enemy!]. He has decided deep in his heart (*im tiefsten Herzen beschlossen* [in the deepest heart] – 4, 103) to go serve in the army (4, 107–110):

*Geh ich gerad in die Stadt und übergebe den Kriegern
Diesen Arm und dies Herz, dem Vaterlande zu dienen.
Sage der Vater alsdann, ob nicht der Ehre Gefühl mir
Auch den Busen belebt und ob ich nicht höher hinauf will!*

[I am going straight into town and proffer the warriors this arm and this heart to serve the fatherland. Let Father say then if a sense of honour not enliven my bosom and if I do not want to rise!]

The mother objects: Hermann has chosen a fine goal, but she knows it has nothing to do with his genuine ambitions (4, 120; 4, 125): *Du verbirgst dein Herz und hast ganz andre Gedanken ... Darum sage mir frei: was dringt dich zu dieser Entschließung?* [You are hiding your heart and have quite different thoughts... Tell me freely about it: what impels you to this decision?]. In response, Hermann takes a different line, this time one with clear physical correlates: his heart, he says, has matured as he has become a man (*Der Jüngling reifet zum Manne* – 4, 127). He admits that his earlier words were meant to hide the feelings that tear at his heart, which he is now prepared to think of in more personal terms (4, 130–141):

*...so still ich auch bin und war, so hat in der Brust mir
Doch sich gebildet ein Herz, das Unrecht hasset und Unbill,
Und ich verstehe recht gut, die weltlichen Dinge zu sondern
... Alles, fühl ich, ist wahr ...
Und doch tadelt Ihr mich mit Recht, o Mutter, und habt mich
Auf halb wahren Worten ertappt und halber Verstellung.
Denn, gesteh ich es nur, nicht ruft die nahe Gefahr mich
Aus dem Hause des Vaters und nicht der hohe Gedanke,
... Worte waren es nur, die ich sprach: sie sollten vor Euch nur
Meine Gefühle verstecken, die mir das Herz zerreißen*

[No matter how quiet I may have been, and am, yet in my breast there has formed a heart that hates injustice and wrong. And I know right well how to tell things apart in this

world, – it's all true, I feel – and yet you're right to fault me, Mother, you've caught me using words half true and half dissimulation, for I'll admit it isn't the danger nearby that calls me out of my father's house, nor a lofty idea, those were just words I was saying, to hide my feelings from you, feelings that are tearing my heart apart].

Now the orchard evokes no human enemy; its beauty itself is inimical to his psychological state (4, 194–96):

*Ach! da kommt mir so einsam vor, wie die Kammer, der Hof und
Garten, das herrliche Feld, das über die Hügel sich hinreckt;
Alles liegt so öde vor mir: Ich entbehre der Gattin*

[Oh, it all seems so lonely for me, the bedroom, the courtyard and garden, the splendid field that stretches out beyond the hill, it is all such a waste for me: I need a wife].

The mother's heartfelt (*herzlich*) love for her son, the condition of whose heart she intuits (*Aber mir ist es bekannt, und jetzo sagt es das Herz mir ... Denn dein Herz ist getroffen und mehr als gewöhnlich empfindlich* [But it is something I am familiar with, and now my heart tells me ... for your heart is touched and more sensitive than usual] – 4, 203–08), has enabled her to negotiate the space between words and feelings, and between those impulses that are noble but alien and those that are true to her son's real feelings.

Fet translates the passage in Canto 4 accurately, but the semantic values of the heart do not evolve as in the original. Hermann's mother asks not what oppresses his heart, but what has made him sad (*Чем огорчен ты, скажи?*), and Hermann responds not by confiding a decision made "in [his] deepest heart", but rather stating that *я решил в душе* [I have decided in my soul]. He offers to lend to his fatherland not, as in the German text, "this arm and this heart" but rather *эту руку и эту грудь* [this arm and this breast]. The mother, in turn, does not feel that "hope lives in [her] heart" that things will work out, but rather, she *питает надежду* [nourishes the hope] that they will. The scene is translated flawlessly, but the translation lacks the repetitive exploitation of heart vocabulary.

Fet's choices in Canto 4 in are consistent with his usual approach. If *Herz* is a synonym of *Seele* or *Geist* (GWB 4, 1079), then for Fet the choice of the Russian equivalent of any one of these words in preference to another would be relatively unconstrained by the wording of the original, and one word is no better a match, or more of a mismatch, than any other word in the corresponding group of synonyms. Beyond this question of technique,

however, Fet's own heart poetics tend to militate against any attempt to match Goethe's wording at every point. In Fet's *Hermann und Dorothea*, the notion of the heart loses much of its moral-intuitive force and becomes, by default, more specific to the marriage theme than in Goethe's text. Goethe's balance of erotic and moral connotations of *Herz* strengthens the connection between the marriage theme and the social-order theme, and this contributes to the effectiveness of the final betrothal. This resonance is unavailable to readers of the translation. The reason for the shift, however, is not that Fet "mismatches" Goethe's *Herz*. Rather, the problem is that both the German and the Russian 'heart' words are used figuratively, but their connotations do not fully coincide. The double theme of the poem receives a uniquely fitting expression in Goethe's German vocabulary of the heart. Fet shifts the rhetoric because Russian vocabulary does not offer him a better choice.

Conclusion

Fet's *Hermann und Dorothea* is an example both of the fidelity characteristic of Fet's work as a translator and of the range of lexical-semantic adjustments that his method sanctions. As would be expected, Fet makes only small changes in the denotational values of the original lexicon, but does not avoid shifts in the rhetoric of the translated poem, as compared with the original.

In Fet's practice, versificational fidelity is of overriding importance. Not only does Fet match his original line by line, as is his goal, but he also sometimes matches phrases virtually syllable-by-syllable within the domain of a hemistich or less, and sometimes his word choice captures not only meaning but also phonic similarities between German and Russian lexical items.

Versification does constrain word choice, and this triggers some lexical semantic changes in the text. We have categorized the changes as either mismatches, which are denotative changes, or shifts, which are usually connotative and are not felt as small-domain mismatches.

Denotative mismatches generally involve non-autosemantic words, such as pronouns, but also sometimes affect autosemantic words, for example nouns. In the case of mismatches involving autosemantic words, however, the mismatched words are usually stereotypical (clichés). Mismatches occur in the local domain, and, vis-à-vis the original text, represent either enrichment or loss. Enrichment may be motivated by context, as when, for example, Fet

translates Goethe's pseudo-classical epithets with greater specificity than in the original, and, in so doing, exploits semantic material available elsewhere in the text. In denotative loss, the lexical meaning associated with a word may be eliminated entirely or it may be simplified. Elimination of denotative meaning occurs when Fet eliminates lexical repetitions or redundancies, sometimes in the context of a small domain in which his selection of a crucial 'pivot' in the text leaves too little space to include all of Goethe's lexical material. In such instances, Fet's translation eliminates semantic material from a particular local context, but not from the text overall. Simplification of denotative meaning occurs when a semantically complex word loses part of its lexical specification, but another part of the semantics is retained; for example, simplification reduces the notion of 'renewal' to 'newness'. A local denotative mismatch can affect the overall rhetorical structure of the poem, but the mismatch itself is discernible on the local level.

In addition to semantic mismatches in the local domain, Fet's translation also shifts some meanings, usually connotative, that accumulate across the domain of the whole poem, even in the absence of a local mismatch. Connotations are deeply embedded in the language and culture of the original text, which is one reason that their exploitation is so important in making the original poem a work of German verbal art. Connotations do not lend themselves to direct translation, although a translator can attempt to construct some comparable textual material to serve as a functional substitute. This was not, however, Fet's choice. Few Russian poets have surpassed Fet as creators of poetic connotation, or as poets for whom connotation so dominates in text. The texts in which Fet exercised his capacity to generate meaning, however, were his own original poetry. He disclaimed any such role for himself as a translator, but rather insisted on a different one, namely as the faithful conduit by which the original text, as conceived by its author, could be transmitted with integrity. Others have argued against Fet's approach to translating or have belittled his successes. Fet himself stressed the modesty of his purpose. It may be suggested, however, that transmitting a great work of verbal art with integrity is no modest aim, nor is a poet of Fet's stature likely to have underestimated its value. If we can discern the limits of Fet's success, this is because of the rigor of his demands on himself, and because of the consistency with which he pursued his goal.

References

- Adelung, Johann Christoph 1793–1801. *Grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch der Hochdeutschen Mundart*. Leipzig: Breitkopf. Digital version by *Digitale-Bibliothek 40*.
- Atwood, Craig D. 2004. Zinzendorf and the Theology of the Heart. In: Atwood, Graig. *Community of the Cross*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 43–75.
- Beutler, Ernst 1935. Von der Ilm zum Susquehanna. Goethe und Amerika in ihren Wechselbeziehungen. In: *Goethe-Kalender auf das Jahr 1935*. Leipzig: Dieterich, 86–153.
- DW = Grimm, Jacob; Grimm, Wilhelm 1854–1954. *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Leipzig: Hirzel. Rpt. 1999, rpt. of ed. 1971–1984.
- Eisenschmidt, Heinrich 1860. *Erinnerungen aus der Krümmerschen Anstalt und aus des Verfassers eigner Schulzeit*. Dorpat: [s.n.]
- Fet 1901 = Фет, Афанасий 1901. Герман и Доротея. In: Никольский, Б. В. (ed.), *Полное собрание стихотворений*. Ст.Петербург: Марк, 117–119.
- Fischer, Paul 1929. *Goethe-Wortschatz*. Leipzig: Emil Rohmkopf Verlag.
- Gessen, L. A. 1960 = Гесен, Л. А. 1960. А. А. Фет. In: Левин, Юрий; Федоров, Андрей (eds.), *Русские писатели о переводе*. Ленинград: Советский писатель, 323–339.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang v. 1958, 1963. Hermann und Dorothea. In: Grumach, Ernst (ed.), *Werke Goethes*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Grigor'ev, Apollon 1999 = Григорьев, Аполлон 1999. *Письма*. Москва: Наука.
- GWB = 1978– . *Goethe-Wörterbuch*. Hg. v. der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen und der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Bd. 1–4: *A-inhaftieren*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Helmerking, Heinz 1948. *Hermann und Dorothea. Entstehung, Ruhm und Wesen*. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag.
- Klenin, Emily 2002. *The Poetics of Afanasij Fet*. Cologne: Böhlau.
- 2011. Modular constraints in translation analysis: The translation of J. W. Goethe's *Hermann und Dorothea* by the Russian Poet Afanasij Fet. In: Küper, Christoph (ed.), *Current Trends in Metrical Analysis*. Frankfurt am Main, etc.: Peter Lang, 229–249.
- LN = Dinesman 2008 = Динесман, Татьяна (ed.) 2008. А. А. Фет и его литературное окружение. In: *Литературное наследство* 103(1). Москва: ИМЛИ РАН.
- Morgan, Peter 1984. The polarization of utopian idealism and practical politics in the idyll: The role of the first 'Bräutigam' in Goethe's *Hermann und Dorothea*. *The German Quarterly* 57(4): 532–545.
- RG = Fet 1893 = Фет, Афанасий 1893. *Ранние годы моей жизни*. Москва: Тип. Мамонтова. Rpt.: Фет, Афанасий 1992. *Воспоминания* 3. Москва: Культура.
- von Gronicka, André 1985. *The Russian Image of Goethe. Vol. 2. Goethe in Russian Literature in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Лексика и риторика фетовского перевода «Германа и Доротеи» Гете

Перевод А. А. Фета «Германа и Доротеи» И. В. Гете является важным ранним образцом его переводческой деятельности, продолжавшейся всю его творческую жизнь, а также свидетельством его хорошо известной верности тексту оригинала. Его важнейшим приоритетом было сохранение особенностей стихосложения оригинала, однако степень лексико-семантической точности его перевода также очень высока и намного превосходит верность оригиналу на других уровнях (фонетическом, грамматическом). Поэт, очевидно, переводил целиком небольшие куски текста, в которых он выделял ключевые моменты семантической информации и вводил их в своем переводе в те же позиции, в которых они находились в оригинале; менее значимый материал он вводил в той мере, в какой это позволяло пространство отрывка. В переводе Фета версификационные ограничения приводили иногда к несоответствиям в семантической денотации. Эти лексико-семантические несоответствия анализируются в статье: в типичных случаях они включают повторы и уже ранее известное, они могут приводить к полной или частичной потере семантики оригинала, либо, напротив, ее обогащению. Иногда также возникает конфликт между денотативными требованиями данного фрагмента текста и общими (как правило, коннотативными) ассоциациями, связанные с более обширным куском текста или текста в целом. В случае возникновения такого конфликта Фет разрешает его в пользу большей точности мелких фрагментов, результатом чего являются семантические изменения ('сдвиги') в структуре текста, приводящие к потере риторической силы перевода по сравнению с оригиналом. Диссонанс между семантикой более обширных и мелких контекстов часто неизбежен ввиду языковой обусловленности семантических коннотаций. Поскольку семантика фетовского перевода есть результат его личных предпочтений, ее можно рассматривать в контексте, во-первых, его образования (он окончил школу незадолго до перевода «Германа и Доротеи»), во-вторых, его двойственного статуса: профессионального русского поэта и двуязычного немецко-русского интеллигента.

Leksika ja retoorika Afanassi Feti tõlkes Goethe "Hermannist ja Dorotheast"

A. A. Feti tõlge J. W. Goethe teosest "Hermann ja Dorothea" on Feti elukestva tõlke-tegevuse oluline varajane näide ning annab tunnistust tema tuntud lähtetekstitruudusest. Peamiselt eelistab ta säilitada lähteteose värsiehituslikke põhijooni, kuid tema leksikaal-semantilise truuduse tase on samuti väga kõrge ning ületab tunduvalt originaaltruudust muudel tasanditel (foneetilise, grammatilise). Luuletaja tõlkis ilmselt holistiliselt väga väikeste tekstiosade kaupa, milles ta vahel isoleeris sõlmpunkte semantilise informatsiooni tuumikus (mille ta paigutas tõlkesse kooskõlas originaaliga), mille ümber sobitus vähemoluline materjal vastavalt sellele, kuidas ruum seda lubas. Feti tekstis võisid värsiehituslikud piirangud vahel viia ka semantilise denotatsiooni leksikaal-semantilistele mittevastavustele ning neid mittevastavusi on artiklis kirjeldatud: tüüpilistel juhtudel

hõlmavad need kordusi, korduvat mainimist või juba teadaolevat informatsiooni, ning mittevastavus võib kaasa tuua ka originaali semantika täieliku või osalise kao või ka rikastumise. Lisaks sellele tekivad vahel ka konfliktid lokaalse osise ja koguteksti suurema domeeni poolt genereeritud kumulatiivsete (tavaliselt konnotatiivsete) denotatiivsete nõuete vahel. Kui sellised konfliktid tekivad, lahendab Fet need väiksema osise täpsust silmas pidades, mille tulemuseks on semantilised muudatused ('nihked') poeetilise teksti osises, mis seetõttu kaotab originaaliga võrreldes osa oma retoorilisest või poeetilisest jõust. Dissonants suure ja väikese domeeni semantika vahel on sageli vältimatu tänu konnotatsioonide keelespetsiifilisele olemusele. Niivõrd kui Feti tõlke semantika on tema isiklike eelistuste tagajärg, võib seda vaadelda tema varasema haridustee kontekstis (millest "Hermann ja Dorothea" tõlkimisel polnud palju möödunud), teiseks aga arvestades tema seisundit nii vene keeles kirjutava kutselise luuletaja kui ka kakskeelse saksa-vene haritlasena.