

# journal of baltic studies

Volume IX, Number 4

Winter 1978

## CONTENTS

### ARTICLES

- Tomas Venclova: Vjacheslav Ivanov—Translator of Kristijonas Donelaitis* . . . . . 291
- Ilse Lehiste: Language Barriers and the Poetry of Ilmar Laaban* . . . . . 305
- Stanisław F. Kolbuszewski: Studies in Metaphony, III: Latvian and Latgalian Vowel Quality in Kariger's Lexicon Lothavicum (ca. 1725)* . . . . . 312
- Marijean Eichel Hawthorné: The New Geography and the Ancient Balts* . . . . . 315
- Grethe Jacobsen: Wicked Count Henry: The Capture of Valdemar II (1223) and Danish Influence in the Baltic* . . . . . 326
- Michael Garleff: Aspekte der deutschbaltischen Geschichtsschreibung in der 2. Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts* . . . . . 339
- Jeffrey A. Ross: Interethnic Relations and Jewish Marginality in the Soviet Baltic* . . . . . 326
- Gert von Pistohlkors: Juhan Kahk's Interpretation of Feudal Agrarian Economy in Estonia and Northern Livonia, 1825-1850: A Review Article* . . . . . 367

### REVIEWS

- Toivo Miljan, The Reluctant Europeans: The Attitudes of the Nordic Countries Towards European Integration (George Maude)* . . . . . 375
- The Livonian Rhymed Chronicle, tr. by Jerry C. Smith and William L. Urban (James A. Brundage)* . . . . . 377
- Documents from Estonia on the Violation of Human Rights (Rein Taagepera)* . . . . . 378
- Velta-Rūķe-Draviņa, The Standardization Process in Latvian—16th Century to the Present (Valdis J. Zeps)* . . . . . 380

Velta Rūķe-Draviņa, *Vārds īstā vietā; Frazeologismu:  
krājums* (Baiba Metzāle-Muzikante) . . . . . 382

NEWS AND NOTES

Personal Notes . . . . . 384

Articles on history appearing in the *Journal* are abstracted by the American Bibliographical Center and appear in *Historical Abstracts*. Articles dealing with the medieval period are abstracted in the *International Medieval Bibliography*. Abstracts of articles on literature, linguistics, and folklore appear in *MLA Abstracts* of the Modern Language Association. The *Journal* is available on microfilm from University Microfilms, a Xerox Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106. USA.

The Editors and Publishers assume no responsibility for statements of fact or opinion made by contributors.

Copyright © 1978 by the Association for the Advancement of Baltic Studies Inc.

ISSN 0162-9778

Circulation 1300

Printed by Augstums Printing Service, Inc., Lincoln, Nebraska 68502, USA.

VJAČESLAV IVANOV – TRANSLATOR OF  
KRISTIJONAS DONELAITIS

*Tomas Venclova, University of California, Los Angeles*

Nearly all Russian Symbolists showed a lively interest in Lithuania.<sup>1</sup> There are various reasons for this, among them the fact that one of the prominent figures in the Symbolist movement – J. Baltrušaitis – was Lithuanian. However, reasons such as this are not sufficient, no matter how significant they might be. Symbolism gravitated toward cultural universalism. From the point of view of its theoreticians, the Symbolist model of the world was realized only partially in contemporary literature since it was inherently characteristic of the creative work of various peoples and periods. The Lithuanian cultural heritage was attractive due to its archaic nature. One could easily sense in this culture relics of primitive integral mythopoetic thought, so close to that of the Symbolists, if only in theory. On the other hand, it is known that the Symbolists had a taste for the exotic and were able to appreciate the individuality and peculiarities of cultures.<sup>2</sup> Lithuania appeared to be exotic, but simultaneously very close to them in time and space, “domestic,” kindred (cf. the later concept of “Eurasianism”).

Vjačeslav Ivanov also had a serious interest in Lithuania. In the tremendous legacy of this Russian poet and thinker one often finds traces of the “Lithuanian theme” to which he devoted all the faculties of his erudition and all-encompassing mind. Ivanov was one of the first to write about M. K. Čiurlionis,<sup>3</sup> interpreting his painting from a viewpoint near those of the Jungians, and considering his creative work an imperfect approximation of the mystery art of the future. Also interesting is his article on J. Baltrušaitis, his friend for many years.<sup>4</sup> Among Ivanov’s translations, some are of Lithuanian poetry.

The fate of these translations is unique. In 1916-17 a collection of Lithuanian literary works translated into Russian was being prepared, but was never published.<sup>5</sup> Vjačeslav Ivanov worked on this book, along with J. Baltrušaitis, K. Bal’mont, V. Brjusov, Ju. Verxovski and A. Remizov. It was assumed that A.

Blok and F. Sologub also would participate. Some of the material for the collection has been preserved. In 1973 J. Tumelis published Ivanov's translations of Lithuanian folk songs.<sup>6</sup> Ivanov translated the beginning (201 lines) of K. Donelaitis' poem *The Seasons* as well, this translation being the topic of the present article.<sup>7</sup>

According to B. Sruoga, Ivanov in practice did not require a literal translation supplied by experts. His broad linguistic background enabled him to translate directly from the Lithuanian text. The project fascinated him and it was assumed that he would translate the entire poem of Donelaitis, and not just its first part "Joys of Spring," but unfortunately this did not come about. The complete Russian translation of the poem was rendered only in 1946 by D. Brodski.

Kristijonas Donelaitis (1714-1780) was the first Lithuanian poet of European stature. He is in many ways unique in eighteenth-century literature. The specific character of his poetic world is closely related to the properties of the Lithuanian language, and primarily of the Lithuanian verb. The structure and expressiveness of Donelaitis' hexameters are unusually difficult to transmit into another language (L. Rhesa, who first translated *The Seasons* into German at the beginning of the last century, maintained that in this respect the poem is significantly more complex than Vergil's *Georgica*).

*The Seasons* is based on an intersection of several semiotic systems. The collision of various language strata is already apparent in the poem on a purely linguistic level. However, even more interesting is the interaction of secondary, artistic codes.

Throughout the poem Donelaitis maintains an invisible connection and communication with antiquity. Here we find frequent (apparently sometimes unconscious) hidden quotations from ancient authors. Donelaitis especially resembles Hesiod: like Hesiod, he gives the moral and practical credo of the farmer, a kind of codex for an integral life. A deep internal relationship with Hellenic antiquity indicates the contrast of Donelaitis' poetics with those of European classicism. He is immersed in the conversational element. His speech is coarse, unrefined, tending to a carnival atmosphere, to be ambivalent praise-abuse (cf. the ideas of M. Bakhtin). Against a background of classicistic texts with their periphrases and mythological nomenclature, even against the background of "low style" compositions, *The Seasons* sounds like shocking dissonance. The poem is not superficially, but genuinely related to the myth – to the Dionysian myth of death and resurrection, eternal renewal of the body of mankind and nature, which was pivotal in the theoretical constructs of Vjačeslav Ivanov.

In addition to the ancient sign system there are at least two more – the sign system of the Christian homily (perception of the world as an orderly and infinite series of correspondences; also biblical symbols, quotations, specific church rhetoric, and so on), and the sign system of Lithuanian humorous folklore with its stereotypes, not only on a stylistic level, but also on the level of events and characters.

All three systems have a common feature – they represent the traditional point of view, which transcends the individual. This is the point of view of man who has not been completely isolated from the “world body” (cf. M. Bakhtin on Rabelais). But to recreate the interrelation of the three systems in another language and within the limits of another poetic tradition is perhaps an impossible task.

Vjačeslav Ivanov’s translation is equilinear, in many places exact, euphonic and in its own way, good. However, a more careful examination reveals how conventional it is.

Incidentally, the Russian Symbolists realized quite well the extent of convention contained in translations. They acknowledged Potebnja’s idea on the mutual impermeability of languages. Furthermore, they usually understood poetic creation as the unique act of establishing relationship between the discrete and integral – an act which is always on the verge of miracle and also of failure. Reconstruction of such act is unthinkable. If the work of art itself is partial and incomplete, then the translation will be doubly partial and incomplete. The translation can provide only the direction of the reader’s search. How closely did Vjačeslav Ivanov indicate this direction to us?

There are obvious mistakes in the translation (these prove that the poet was working directly from the original and was not using any of the three German translations which existed at that time). In lines 27-28 one finds words *byk*, *stado*, *vygon*, and *rev*, which do not correspond to the original. Donelaitis here does not speak specifically about a bull (*byk*), but rather about any living creature. Such inaccuracies are characteristic and we shall return to them. Two other lines (39-40) are erroneously translated, the Russian text here contradicting the Lithuanian (Donelaitis describes a bird “with a threadbare crest” suffering from hunger). However, those and similar minutiae are not the principal issue. We are concerned rather with the structural dominants of the text and the tendencies which permeate it.

A substantial dislocation is noted on the rhythmical level. Donelaitis’ poem, as we mentioned, is written in hexameters, as is the translation.<sup>8</sup> But the most acute difference between the verse of Donelaitis and that of Ivanov is apparent even to the inexperienced ear. It is true that both hexameters deviate from the traditional. Although in Lithuanian vowel length is phonologically significant (in sixteenth-century Lithuanian poetry there even existed quantitative hexameter), the verse of Donelaitis, as well as that of Ivanov, is based on qualitative principle.<sup>9</sup> The difference lies elsewhere: Donelaitis’ poem has a specific proportion of disyllabic feet. As is well known, any one of the first four trisyllabic (dactylic) feet of a hexameter can be replaced by a disyllabic (spondaic) foot. In this way sixteen hexameter variants are conceivable. The table below shows their distribution in the fragment of Donelaitis’ poem we are analyzing and in the corresponding Ivanov translation (D = trisyllabic feet, S = disyllabic; the last two feet are not shown in the table, since their form is fixed):

| Variants | Number of lines |        |
|----------|-----------------|--------|
|          | Donelaitis      | Ivanov |
| 1. SSSS  | 114             | 0      |
| 2. DSSS  | 21              | 0      |
| 3. SDSS  | 20              | 0      |
| 4. SSSD  | 12              | 0      |
| 5. SSDS  | 11              | 0      |
| 6. DDSS  | 7               | 2      |
| 7. DS DS | 4               | 2      |
| 8. SDDS  | 4               | 10     |
| 9. DSSD  | 3               | 0      |
| 10. SDDS | 3               | 1      |
| 11. SSDD | 2               | 1      |
| 12. DSDD | 0               | 6      |
| 13. DDSD | 0               | 16     |
| 14. SDDD | 0               | 18     |
| 15. DDDS | 0               | 42     |
| 16. DDDD | 0               | 103    |

An even more significant tally is that of the common number of D and C: Donelaitis has, in 201 lines (1206 feet), 895 (74%) disyllabic feet and 311 (26%) trisyllabic, while Ivanov has 315 (26%) and 891 (74%) respectively. As the table and this tally both demonstrate, the rhythmical patterns of the original and the translation *are in perfect opposition to each other*.

It is also interesting to compare caesuras: in Donelaitis we find 143 so-called Latin caesuras, 34 Greek, 9 double, 12 caesuras after the fourth ictus and 3 lines with doubtful or absent caesura. Ivanov uses a smaller proportion of Latin caesuras (117) and a sharply increased proportion of Greek (70); there are 12 double caesuras and 2 after the fourth ictus.

Donelaitis has in practice created a Lithuanian hexameter for the first time, where there was none (in all probability he was not aware of the sixteenth century attempts). He was limited only by the most general ancient model, by the characteristics of the Lithuanian language and the requirements of poetic expression. Vjačeslav Ivanov takes into account the specific context – the great tradition of Russian hexameter and probably first of all Žukovskij's hexameter. The correspondence of the sharply "spondaicized" vigorous line of Donelaitis and the smooth line of Ivanov is completely conventional: originality is converted into literariness, the artistic primitive – into habitual style, and the archaic – into the nineteenth (and twentieth) century.

It should also be noted that rhythm in Donelaitis is clearly correlated with semantics. Against a monotonous spondaic background one can point out, for example, the fragment about the nightingale (80-112), in which the proportion of the "norm" (only 14 lines of the type SSSS) is decreased, and there is an

increase in the proportion of lines which most clearly depart from the norm, containing two trisyllabic feet (5 such lines). Still more obvious is the fragment about the eagle (155-169): of the 15 lines, only 5 are “normal” and 6 strongly deviate from the norm! At the same time the appearance of the eagle is marked rhythmically (155 is DDSS, a Greek caesura). In the translation these passages are somewhat smoothed ones, although Vjačeslav Ivanov for his part rhythmically marks certain significant fragments and lines (48-56,73).

The translation’s euphony is usually splendid. It is worth mentioning, for example, the pattern of consonants in the first three lines, where the phonemes of two key words – *solnce* and *zemiĵa* are repeated in various combinations. Lines 67-68 and many others are just as good. A detailed analysis of this level for the two texts would lead us too far astray. We shall limit ourselves to the general observation that Donelaitis does not yield to his translator with respect to “sound coherency” (cf. if only for the brilliant passage in the original about the nightingale – lines 105-108). Nevertheless Donelaitis is less refined and frequently resorts to the simplest juxtaposition of two phonetically similar words (*šūķteri šūtką* – ‘screams out a joke’ – 112; *ķirminą kramto* ‘chews the worm’ – 147).

An analogous shift from archaic to literary can be seen on the syntax level. The line of Donelaitis represents a syntactic and semantic unit. Very often two consecutive lines are parallel, and the second begins with the conjunction “and” (*ir, irgi*) or “but” (*o, oĝi*). In all, the original has 41 cases where lines begin with “and,” and 23 where lines begin with “but.” There are numerous anaphoras (*vislab . . . vislab* ‘everything,’ 9-12; *valgyk . . . valgyk* ‘eat!’ 139-41), parallel binary clausulas (e.g., *ošino dainos* ‘songs were filling with noise’ . . . *skambino garsai* ‘sounds were filling with harmony,’ 65-66), other binary constructions (e.g., *žiurkės su šeškais* ‘rats with polecats’ . . . *varnos ir varnai* ‘crows and ravens’ . . . *pelės su vaikais* ‘mice with children’ . . . *musės ir vabalai* ‘flies and beetles,’ 13-16). The result of this accumulation of binary constructions and parallelisms (frequently reinforced by assonance) is a structure close to that of homilies or folksongs. It can be monotonous, but is unquestionably powerful. In the translation all these constructive traits of *The Seasons* are lost. The integrity of the line is shattered. Ivanov introduces devices which are extremely alien to Donelaitis: *enjambement* (no less than 39 instances, compared to one or two in the original!), fragmented and complicated syntactic constructions, short phrases (54-55, 113-4), parentheses, and finally, questions and answers in place of direct statements (cf. 91-92, 107, 114, 152).

Also lost are numerous epic devices of Donelaitis – his fixed epithets and *loci communes*, which for the Lithuanian reader are a most important characteristic of “Donelaitis’ subcode” within the code of the Lithuanian literary language. Not translated at all are the recurring epithets *didei* ‘greatly’ (38, 48, 100, 120), *meilingas* ‘tender’ (47-89), *sumišai* ‘mixedly’ (42, 67), although it would not have been difficult to find natural Russian equivalents for these. Inconsistently translated are other epithets of the same type (*glūpas* ‘silly’) or recur-

ring constructions: *šokinėdami džiaugės* 'rejoiced capering' (25, 42), *ošims/ūžims pasikėlė* 'noise/rumble rose' (33, 155), *neprietelis žmogus* 'man the foe' (167, 186) and others. In a word, we can observe a transformation from the aesthetics of identity to the aesthetics of opposition (Ju. Lotman's terms).

As we already said, Donelaitis' aesthetics of identity do not contradict the certain polylingualism of the poem. Vjačeslav Ivanov attempts to convey this polylingualism primarily on the lexical level. In the translation we can easily separate the lexical and stylistic strata which we can conventionally call 'ecclesiastic' (57, 72, 76-77, 82, 84, 97, 119, 138, 175, 178, 182, etc.) and "colloquial," "folkloric-krylovian" (8, 12, 14-15, 20, 29, 38-39, 49-50, 120, 123, 125, 146, 150, 197, etc.). True, in the original, the "ecclesiastical" nuance is more frequently expressed not in the lexicon, but by a system of intonations (this is generally characteristic of Lithuanian), but the measure of convention applied here by Ivanov is quite acceptable. This cannot be said for the third lexico-stylistic stratum, the "literary". For Donelaitis it would be unthinkable to use such expressions (sometimes of doubtful taste) as *lazur'* (70), *svirel'naja sladkaja pesnja* (95),<sup>10</sup> *zvuki ronjaja* (99), *volšebnaja vest'*, *solov'inoe čudo* (104), *uzyvno smeeš'sja i plačeš'* (109), *sermjažnyj bogatyr'* (127-8), *molnziej dal'nej nastig* (168). Intermingled with the first two strata, these expressions provide a strange and even comic effect. By the way, the stylistic deviations from the original in lines 116-7 and 157-69 are interesting and significant. They liken the text to those with which the early twentieth century reader was familiar. In describing the modest attire of the nightingale, Ivanov draws a pastoral scene, emphasizing the motif of game and mask (but not humility, monasticity, like Donelaitis). In the eagle's speech one hears "imperial" (Petrine, if you will) intonations, whereas Donelaitis' eagle is more of the provincial, patriarchal monarch (of the German type).

Ivanov approximates the translation to the habitual aesthetics by other means as well. By introducing capital letters he makes use of conventional mythologemes, commonplace for the Russian reader, but quite impossible for Donelaitis. In the original, of course, we observe simply winter and spring, not the "old sorcerer Winter" or "tenderly smiling" Spring. Such astonishing transformation is akin to turning, let us say, Breughel into Boecklin. A change can also be found even in places where the translation seems to be faithful. Ivanov translates Donelaitis' diminutives (*solnyško*, *ptička*), but in Lithuanian, especially in Lithuanian folklore tradition the diminutive is far more neutral and "normal" than in literary Russian, where it has an infantile sentimental tinge. The same happened with the word *pasaka* (72,100). By translating it according to the dictionary (*skazka*), Ivanov creates a romantic picture, while for Donelaitis the word *pasaka* (literally "folktale") has the primary meaning "speech" or even "chatter," "rubbish."

Donelaitis is a poet of the verb, of *process*, whereas Vjačeslav Ivanov is more the poet of the substantive, of *the resulting state*.<sup>11</sup> The world of *The Seasons* is a world of familiar, domestic, commonplace objects. But at the same time this



is a serious and intense world, an arena where elements and elementary forces confront each other. Any natural state, movement or sound is intensified by Donelaitis. He accomplishes this by extensive use of the phonetic, morphological, and semantic resources of the Lithuanian verb system (particularly suffixes which indicate modes of action-shortness or momentariness, effort, repetition). The translation has a rich vocabulary, but the verbs used are usually less expressive. Frequently verb forms are translated by paraphrases or a series of substantives (*kopinėjo* ‘climbed’ – *zanesli . . . kryl’ja* 35; *kriunėdami* ‘wheezing’ – *kašel’ starčeskij dušit* 103; *birbina galvas* ‘keep dinning [into our] heads’ – *našemu vzoru zabava* 137; cf. also 33-34, etc.). Thus the specific humor of Donelaitis is also lost (however it cannot be ruled out that certain verbs used by Donelaitis have a humorous “strange” nuance only for contemporary Lithuanian readers). On the other hand the translator is constantly explaining the original, adding synonyms and attributes, complicating epithets (e.g. *blusos* ‘fleas’ – *bloxi-prygun’i* 16; *rudėnį ar žiemos čėse* ‘in the autumn or in the winter time’ – *osen’ju pozdnej, zimoju gluxoj* 88; *žioplys* ‘blockhead’ – *paren’pustoj, vetrogon* 120; *skruzdėlės* ‘ants’ – *murav’i xlopotlivyje* 141; *niekings* ‘worthless’ – *ničtožnyj i suetnyj* 63, 145; *margas* ‘motley’ – *pestrocvetnyj* 139; *dyvinas* ‘wonderful’ – *kak raduga, jarkie* 140.<sup>12</sup> In general we can say that *simple* objects in Donelaitis’ poem undergo *complex* metamorphoses. In the translation the objects are more complex, the world made richer by nuances, but also more static.

Here we come to the deepest semantic shift in the translation. The world of Donelaitis is one of fluid, impetuous materiality, and exists in cyclical time.<sup>13</sup> Here everything is constantly being renewed through death. The mythical concept of time is expressed, in particular, by the fact that one can begin the poem at any one of its four parts, and that Donelaitis’ characters do not have individual, personal destinies; it is impossible to construct their biographies logically. The spatial world of Donelaitis is arranged vertically.<sup>14</sup> Although Vjačeslav Ivanov translated only a small fragment of the poem, he substantially reaccentuated its spatial-temporal pattern. This can be felt from the very first lines of the poem.

For Donelaitis, nature undergoes changes which one would want to call “ontological”. Foaming *snow* is transformed into *nothing* (the opposition is emphasized by the sound connexion: *sniegs . . . į nieką*). The warm air summons all the grass to *rise from the dead* (all the grass – *žoleles visokias* – possibly is reminiscence from the Lithuanian Bible).<sup>15</sup> *Everything* that *has died* weeping, comes out to greet summer. In the translation the images of change are concretized, but the transformations themselves turn out to be superficial:

Ryxlyj truxljavilsja sneg i, kak mutnaja pena, *istajal*  
(melted; 4).

Pole teplyn’ obnjala i živitel’noj laskoj prigrela,  
Travku iz noči mogil’noj na svet pomanila; *prosnulas’*  
(awoke)

Pervaja travka . . . (5-7).  
. . . čto zastyllo v predsmertnoj toske (was frozen with death anguish) –

švelilos', očnuvšis' (regained consciousness; 9).

Donelaitis is constantly concerned with *everything* (*visur* 'everywhere,' *visokios* 'every,' *visi* 'all,' *vislab* 'everything', with huge shapes, large masses, with a unified, general movement of the world. The translator's point of view is different: several *fields* are transformed into a single *field*; *grasses*, into a *small grass*; *pine forests*, into a *young fir grove*. If Donelaitis looks at the world as if from above, then Vjačeslav Ivanov scrutinizes it from an intimate position, at close range. Color is introduced into the gamut of the poem (*bluish-grey* clouds instead of *black*, 73). In the original, living creatures appear in groups – in “herds,” “regiments,” “families,” with individuals among them not distinguished. In the translation the “close-up” prevails, with the plural being replaced by the singular:

Ščurjas' (squinting), xor' vyxodil iz promerzloj nory domovitoj (13).

“Polno dremat!” – domočadcev pčelinaja matka *tolkala* (jostled; 19).

Prygal ot radosti volk, i medved' pripljasyval, *vozdux Njuxaja* . . . (sniffing; 25-26).

The transformation of the spatial orientation has in fact already been given in the first line of the poem, where the movement of the sun in a vertical plane (*saulelė* . . . *atkopdama* 'sun . . . climbing') is replaced by movement in a horizontal plane (*solnyško k nam povernulos' opjat* ).

Donelaitis perceives the world as *whole*, as a *common body* (he can even talk about the “pose” of the world – *sviets jau miegt išigūžtęs* 'world sleeps already curled up,' 83. Vjačeslav Ivanov dissects the world and transforms it into a multipartite and multiform spectacle, emphasizing minute spatial relations which are not even mentioned in the original (53, 58, 180). The syntax of the represented world in both textes is completely different. Donelaitis is closer to an ancient myth, while Ivanov, who lives in an age when the myth is being destroyed, only theoretically poses the problem of its reconstruction. Donelaitis perceives the world as a chorus, a kind of a mystery play, whereas Ivanov only attempts to perceive it in such manner. The choral, Dionysian, carnival element in Donelaitis' poem exists, so to speak, on deep structure level; Ivanov brings it to the surface, to the vocabulary (67, 82). The semantic tendencies of the original and of the translation also turn out to be *in opposition to each other*.

Notwithstanding all his erudition and mastery, Vjačeslav Ivanov considerably altered the optics of the original, shifted and reevaluated Donelaitis' poetic model. Stating this change is not a reproach. In the words of the Polish literary scholar E. Balcerzan, a researcher is required to “evaluate the text of a translation from the point of view of the normative poetics of the original whether or not he himself professes these poetics. He must be interested in any ‘inaccuracy’ by the translator, in every deviation from the original, even if he considers that the principle of accuracy or slavish devotion has been compromised.”<sup>16</sup> An encounter of two great poets helps one to understand each of them, and analyzing the differences between their poetic structures is a step toward such understanding.

## NOTES

- 1 This has been discussed by numerous Lithuanian scholars – A. Samulionis and D. Straukaitė, J. Tumelis and others, as well as by the author of the present paper.
- 2 Cf. M. Gasparov, “Brjusov i bukvalizm,” *Masterstvo perevoda*, 8 (1971), 88-128.
- 3 V. Ivanov, “Čurlianis i problema sinteza iskusstv” in *Apollon*, 1914, no. 3. Also in V. Ivanov, *Borozdy i meži* (Moskva, 1916).
- 4 V. Ivanov, “Jurgis Baltrušajtis, kak liričeskij poet” in S.A. Vengerov, ed., *Russkaja literatura XX veka, 1890-1910*, vol. 2 (Moskva, 1915), 301-11.
- 5 B. Sruoga has described the history of the collection; see his *Raštai*, 6 (1957), 530-56.
- 6 *Gde devjat' slivaetsja rek: Litovksie narodnye pesni v perevode russkix poetov* (Vilnius, 1973), 51-56.
- 7 A typewritten version of the translation is preserved in the ms. section of the Institute of Lithuanian Language and Literature of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, under F.8. Lines 1-119 were published in Kristijonas Donelaitis, *Jau saulelė vėl . . .* (Vilnius, 1963) Lines 120-201 are published here for the first time.
- 8 In three lines of the translation (70, 86, 143) slips of pen have resulted in incorrect meter; these instances have been called attention to in our text.
- 9 Donelaitis' hexameter is discussed in detail in M. Ročka's unpublished dissertation (Vilnius, 1949); the basic theses of the dissertation are summarized in M. Ročka, “K. Donelaičio eilėdara” in Kristijonas Donelaitis' *Raštai* (Vilnius, 1950). I note in this connection the opinion of M. Lotman (to my mind debatable) that Donelaitis' should be viewed as an example of the accentual-quantitative-syllabic system of versification (M. Ju. Lotman, “Hexameter” *Studia metrica et poetica*, 1 (Tartu Riikliku ülikooli toimetised, 396 [1976]), 49.
- 10 “Fife” or “trumpet,” which appear in the original, are substantially different from *svirel'* ‘reed-pipe,’ which carries specific literary-historical connotations.
- 11 Cf. A. Belyj, *Poëzija slova* (Petrograd, 1922), 41 etc.
- 12 It is interesting that where Donelaitis uses only two names of God (Dievas, Sutvertojis), Ivanov uses seven (Bog, Vsevyšnij, Vsemoguščij, Gospod', Otec, Sozdatel', Tvorec).
- 13 Cf. Ju. M. Lotman, *Stat' i po tipologii kul'tury*, 2 (Tartu, 1973), 9-41.
- 14 I have devoted an article specifically to these questions: “Erdvė ir laikas Kristijono Donelaičio *Metuose*,” *Poezijos pavasaris* (Vilnius, 1971), 212-8.
- 15 This line (6) in the original is marked rhythmically (the dactylic opening the Greek caesura surrounded by spondaic openings and Latin caesuras).
- 16 E. Balcerzan, *Styl i poetyka twórczosci dwujęzycznej Brunona Jasińskiego* (Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków, 1968), 44.

## TRANSLATION

## ВЕШНЕЕ ВЕСЕЛЬЕ

- Солнышко к нам повернулось опять--и Землю будило;  
Труд терпеливый колдуньи-Зимы разрушая, смеялось;  
Стуж валило затей, и льдов заставы ломало.  
Рыхлый груклявился снег и, как мутная пена, истаял.  
5 Поле теплынь обняла и живительной лаской пригрела,  
Травку из ночи могильной на свет поманила: проснулась  
Первая травка; кустарник, молоденький ельник проснулись.  
С голых холмов сползли кожухи, с кустяров упали.  
Все, что застыло в предсмертной тоске,--шевелилось, очнувшись;  
10 Что под хранительной толщей озерного льда уцелело  
Или, под кровом своим утясь, лихолетье проспало,--  
Скопом повылезло все на простор, покидая зимовье.  
Шурясь, хорь выходил из промерзлой норы домовитой.  
Совы, сороки, вороны, отколь ни возьмись, на добычу  
15 Зарились. Крот, землеройка с мышатами ведро хвалили.  
Мухи, жуки, комары, мошкара и блохи-прыгуны  
Сбор к походу трубили, людей воевать ополчались,  
Рты разевали--кусать мужиков и господ без различья.  
"Полно дремать!"--домочадцев пчелиная матка толкала,  
20 В поле на промысл богатый гнала, научала прибытку:  
Выползли пчелки из щелок и вырвались роем гудящим,  
Стали кружить и летать по лугам с игрою свирельной.  
Ткать между тем пауки по углам снаряжались, сетями  
Ловчую снасть расстилали и лазали тихо по снасти.  
25 Прыгал от радости волк, и медведь приплясывал, воздух  
Нюхая, и на охоту влачился, чуя наживу.  
Чудо-то, диво какое! Ведь бык ни единый из стада  
С выгона к нам, на село, не вернулся с ревом голодным.  
Не на что плакаться ныне: везде под солнцем приволье.  
30 Кончилась лютой Зимы страда полевая; старуха  
Прочь убралась, и нежно Весна улыбалась повсюду.  
Жизнь кишела в раздольях, по зарослям гулом гудела:  
Выклики, свист, пискотня, разнозвучный, неугомонный  
Гомон: кто густо в глуши прохрипит, кто тонкою трелью  
35 Сверху залетяся; кого занесли до поднебесья крыльях,  
Кто копошится в листве и, лазая, Господа славит.  
Много разинуто ртов, а на скудную пищу не ропшут.  
За зиму, правда, одежда на том, на другом поистерлась:  
Горюшка мало! Плешив улетел,--хохлатым вернулся;  
40 Да не один хохолок раздобыл, а и власть посебал.

- Все в суматохе, а жалоб нигде не заслышишь на усталъ:  
 Все довольны, резвы; труд-потеха, хлопоты-праздник.  
 В стае сватов-соседей пожаловал аист, веселый,--  
 Клювом хозяйским стучать принялся по балясине лога,  
 45 Что из жердей навертели, из хвороста, загодя, люди.  
 Скрипом и стуком радушным откликнулась важному стучу,  
 Мужа встречая, хозяйка, и стали хозяйничать дружно,  
 Дом воздушный чинить: обветшало гнездо, растрепалось.  
 Две лишь весны простояло жилье: ' и ново, и прочно  
 50 Летось было еще, а теперь по углам развалилось.  
 Там не хватает стропила, а тут и целую стенку  
 С гребнем, в буйном набеге, крылатые ветры сорвали.  
 Дырами окна зияют; дверей осели пороги;  
 Вся покривилась изба. Хлопот полон рот--по устройству  
 55 Крова надежного. Мешкать нельзя. Смышляют супруги,  
 Как им обладать уют и семейные справить потребности.  
 Веток охалку сухих попечительный домовладыка  
 В воздухе тащит; внутри конопатит щели подруга.  
 Целый, без отдыха, день, прилежные, трудятся оба;  
 60 После за ужином вдруг улетят, на охоту помчатся,  
 Жаб да лягушек с десятков отведают,--вот их ловитва;  
 Так подкрепившись, Творца славословят в сердце довольном.  
 О, человек ничтожный и суетный! Здесь научайся  
 Мальм довольствоваться дух и, насытяться, помни о Боге!..  
 65 Роши, кустарник, леса оглашались пеньем пернатых;  
 Поле звенело, и луг гомонил; все вместе звучало,  
 В слитном хоре смесив голоса; куковала кукушка,  
 И ликовали дрозды; все кликами славило Бога.  
 Реяли ласточки; ввись, легкокрылые, быстро взвивались,  
 70 Чтобы (sic) из лазури стрелой, играючи, ринуться наземь;  
 Лётом натешившись, пищей простой, без приправ, услаждались;  
 Трапезу кончив, опять щебетали старую сказку.  
 Дивно, до облак сизых, взмывал журавль голосистый;  
 Зычною жалобой вопль скрежещущий реял, подобный  
 75 Плачу; но не был то плач, и не жалоба в небе звенела:  
 С выпренных мест глашатай гласил о могуществе Божьем.  
 Есть в песнопении птиц благовестие Тайны чудесной!..  
 Внемля вещаньям таким, воробьи зачирикали: "Все мы,  
 Птички, Создателя хвалим, и род воробьиный не хуже  
 80 Прочих крылатых певцов"... Соловей же, хитрец, притаившись,  
 Ждал, пока своего не скончает каждый напева:  
 В хор многогласный вступать искони возлюбил он послушным.  
 Вешнею ночью, как все замолчит и задремлет, укрыто  
 Теплою мглой, он один всеночное правит служенье.  
 85 День светает,--и мы, покидая сонное ложе,

- Слышим: поет соловей, и встаем с весельем (sic) сердца.  
 Боже преславный, какое во всем учредил Ты согласие!  
 Осенью поздней, зимою глухой мы, попрятавшись в домы,  
 На печь спать улеглись и, свернувшись комом, храпели:
- 90 В косной дреме и тебя не расслышали б, милая птичка!  
 Так же ль ты крепко спала, как и мы, в темноте и в уюте?  
 Так же ль, в беспамятстве, мух ловила ты зевом раскрытым?  
 Ныне ж, в годину, когда мы, веселые, праздник весенний  
 Празднуем и зачинать собрались полевые работы,--
- 95 Во время ты завела свирельную сладкую песню:  
 Вновь переливами звуков живых умиляешь нам сердце,  
 Радостью учишь дышать и к страде благодатной бодришь нас.  
 Что ж так ревниво от нас ты, соловушко звонкий, таишься,  
 Первые звуки роняя в густеющих сумерках ночи?
- 100 Сказочник милый, почто с человеком в прятки играешь?  
 Все, кто на свете живут,--селянин и барин надутый,  
 Дети, что мчатся, рубаху задрав, и деды, которых  
 Кашель старческий душит,--все песнь твою хвалят согласно,  
 Ловят все волшебную весть, соловьиное чудо.
- 105 Ты запоешь,--и не звучен орган, и глухи цимбалы;  
 Скрипка и канкли, пред кликом твоим, пристыженно смолкают.  
 Нежно смеешься--чему? Не Юргиса ль кличешь, покличешь:  
 "Юргис, Юргис, коней запрягай, подхлестни, да скачи вскачь!"  
 С вечера, спрятавшись, ты так узывно смеешься и плачешь...
- 110 За день истома сморит нас, мы валимся с ног на постели:  
 Бодрствуешь ты перед Богом за нас, певуний царица!  
 Сходит ночь: все славней, все торжественней песнь твоя льется!  
 Ты же--невидима нам. Но случалось--тебя открывали  
 В чаще,--и что ж? Ты являлась очам--в паневе посконной,
- 115 Серой, какая к лицу деревеншине лишь воробьиной.  
 Так, ты господских рубах кружевных и тюрбанов не любишь:  
 Любо сельчанам своим предстоять поселянской царице.  
 То ж и в людском общежитье не раз примечали мы, други:  
 Суетно ценится блеск показной на торжищах света.
- 120 Диксас--парень пустой, ветрогон. Бахвальства, да лени--  
 В городе он набрался. Что ни день, по сему выступает  
 Шеголем,--словно петух гребешком величается. Люди  
 Окрест глазект. Зачнет разглагольствовать: глупые речи  
 Слушая, добрый мужик плеваться должен, дивуясь,
- 125 Как пустомеля такой к тому ж и кошунствовать смеет;  
 Сам ухмыляется нагло: чем я, де, не барин ученый?  
 Нет, посравни-ка ты лучше, как лапотник Кризас (сермяжный  
 Он богатырь; день-деньской, как вол, работает) о Боге  
 В час досужий, в лачуге своей, беседует: сладко  
 130 Слушать соседям его,--соловьем заливается Кризас...

- Ты ж, соловушко-птичка, --убранством ли только вельможным?--  
 Нет, и столом небрежешь, да и наших лакомств не любишь,  
 Брезгуешь варевом жирным, мясным, колбасою, да салом.  
 Ни пирогов, ни лепешек, ни сладких питий не вкушаешь,  
 135 Скромное яство свое ключевой запиная водицей.  
 Только, псалмы ты свои распеваячи, Божия птичка,  
 Не забывай насыщаться; что нашему взору забава, --  
 То соделал тебе насущною снедью Всевышний.  
 Кушай себе на здоровье жука пестроцветного, кушай  
 140 Тех, что на грече, жучков и стрекоз, как радуга, ярких;  
 Ешь муравьев хлопотливых со всем нерожденным их родом.  
 Ужин добыв, и людей помяни, улетаая в дубраву,  
 Песню в глуши просвиши, чтобы (sic) до позднего лета звучало:  
 "Юргис, Юргис, коней запрягай, подхлестни, да кати вскачь!"  
 145 Ты, человек ничтожный и суетный, здесь научайся  
 Малым довольствоваться дух: любишь праздновать, знай и поститься.  
 Глянь на птичек: одна червячком пробавляется тощим  
 За день: другая, зерна не сыскав, --стебельком. Обретают  
 Странницы, из-года в год, от полуденных стран прилетаая,  
 150 С голым посулом весны молодой голодную нажить:  
 Жалобы все ж ни одна не несет, терпеливая, к Богу.  
 Ты, человек, не гораздо ль щедрей одарен Всемогущим?  
 Что ж, в незадачливый день, ворчишь на годину скупую,  
 Свой привередливый рот толокном набивая сладимым?..  
 155 Это слышали птицы, --шум подняли, хохот и гомон, --  
 Дым коромыслом, --как вдруг, с поднебесья, --оклик орлиный:  
 "Что за содом, крикуны? Что горло дерете всем сходом?  
 Благоволили мы речь к вам держать самолично. Внимайте ж!..  
 Тотчас, клеток слышав, все сонмище сдвинулось густо,  
 160 Смолокло, словцо боясь проронить, затаило дыханье.  
 "Ваши мы слуги", --щебечут передние: "что ваша милость  
 Нам приказать соизволит?" Орел им: "Благоугодно  
 Знать нам: как наш любимый народ зимовал эту зиму?  
 В чем нужду в лихолетье терпел, и все ль уцелели?  
 165 Может быть, злая сова или хорь кровожадный душил вас?  
 Ястреб ли хищный кого закогтил? Загрызла ль куница?  
 Или кого, поди, человек, наш ворог заклятый,  
 Молнией дальней настиг, а не то--и живого повесил,  
 После ж на гнутом железе изжарил в пламени дымном!"  
 170 Так испытуя, весь сход озирал опекун остроокий.  
 Аист, в ответ, поднялся на гнезде, как вельможа сановный,  
 С важным поклоном, и складным речам подплясывал в лад он.  
 "Бог", --так аист за всех отвечал, --"сей мир создавая,  
 Множеством тварей живых населил громаду вселенной;  
 175 Каждой промыслил Он яство свое, житие представил:

- Всюду, куда ни посмотришь,--воочию чудо Господне.  
Полчища в воду отец посылал, и полчища в поле;  
Множеству третьему крылья судил и пути на воздушех.  
Сколько сородичей наших в лесу притаилось, в овраге!
- 180 Сколько порхает в лугах, копошится в зыблемых злаках!  
Иль у людей, на дворах, пищит, кудахчет, гогочет!  
Каждой твари дает в благовремение пищу Создатель.  
Правда, приходит и пост, и денек доведется голодный,  
Если ненастьем повеет, и пасмурно небо. Бывает
- 185 Также и кара на свет наслана за грехи человека.  
Все же горчайшее зло--человек! То и дело, нас мучит;  
Род наш пугает стрельбою, и многих на смерть сражает.  
Любит с детьми разлучать родителей нежных; громит он  
Гнезда наши в укромной листве, и птенцов похищает.
- 190 Или же, зерна рассыпав, как некий благотворитель,  
Глупеньких птиц приманить норовит к засаде коварной.  
Только отважся кто клюнуть предложенный корм, пропадет он  
Сам и ватагу друзей завлечет в неразрывные сети,  
Иль подведет под ружье: бьет, да бьет легковерных охотник.
- 195 Есть,--греха не укрыть,--и меж птиц разбойники: тайно  
Другом и кровным они насыщаются, братоубийцы.  
Ястреб, обманщик и тать, и сова, воровской атаман их,  
Ворон и все воронье, с их подруженькой, сватьей-сорочкой,  
Много (то ведомо всем), что ни год, бедняков истребляют!
- 200 Все ж душегубца такого меж нас отродясь не бывало,  
Как человек, коль разинет он рот за лакомой пищей."