

the accident of a heathen birth, and reward others for a privilege they did nothing to earn?" [3, p. 196]. The question becomes still more urgent when she makes it intimately personal: "This is what I carried out of the Congo on my crooked little back. In our seventeen months in Kilanga, thirty-one children died, including Ruth May. Why not Adah? I can think of no answer that exonerates me" [3, p. 468]. It is very difficult to answer such questions, even more so, if one's personal experience evidences to the unfairness and often absurd and unexpected turns in the life. Adah feels that Christianity as she knows it cannot provide her with the sufficient answers and therefore represents a weak support in man's anxieties: "It crosses my mind that I may need a religion. Although Mother has one now, and she still suffers. I believe she talks to Ruth May more or less constantly, begging forgiveness when no one is around. Leah has one: her religion *is* the suffering. Rachel doesn't, and she is plainly the happiest of us all. Though it could be argued that she is, herself, her own brand of goddess" [3, p. 499].

As universal human experience, suffering cannot be removed from man's life. Kingsolver's *The Poisonwood Bible* suggests that although its experience is unpleasant and uncomfortable, its meaning is justified by one's testimony, by sharing one's life story which may provide shelter and inner reconciliation for others. Kingsolver's characters express radical scepticism about rigid and blind faith and they show that there is no substitute for love and affection. In characters' grief-stricken lives separation and exposure, closeness and distance as well as intimacy and estrangement are entangled in a way which proves that the female world of illusion and emotion (represented by the Price women) is of a much higher value than the male world of the supposed truth (represented by Nathan Price). Although, at the end, we may conceive of several different life-philosophies concerning suffering as represented by the characters, the one which stands markedly apart is spoken by Orleanna in her address to Ruth May: "My little beast, my eyes, my favorite stolen egg. Listen. To live is to be marked. To live is to change, to acquire the words of a story, and that is the only celebration we mortals really know. In perfect stillness, frankly, I've only found sorrow" [3, p. 438]. This is the philosophy which Kingsolver pronounces in her novel *Flight Behavior* as well: "Nothing stays the same, life is defined by a state of flux" [6, p.307]. To live also means to suffer, yet the significance of suffering is always revealed in the complexity of its context and through the testimonies of the individual stories of those who are in pain.

### References

1. CROISY, Sophie: Re-visioning Southern identity: transatlantic cultural collisions in Barbara Kingsolver's *The Poisonwood Bible*. In *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 3, September 2012, pp. 222-233.
2. HAMPSON, Robert: *Introduction*. In Conrad, Joseph: *Heart of Darkness*. London: Penguin Books, 1995, 166 p. ISBN 978-0140186529
3. KINGSOLVER, Barbara: *The Poisonwood Bible*. London: Harper Collins, 2007, 616 p. ISBN 9780571201754
4. LEONARD, John: Kingsolver in the Jungle, Catullus & Wolfe at the Door. In *The Nation*, January 11/18, 1999, pp. 28-33.
5. PURCELL, William F.: The Gospel According to Barbara Kingsolver. Brother Fowles and St. Francis of Assisi in *The Poisonwood Bible*. In *LOGOS* 12:1, Winter 2009, pp. 93-116.
6. KINGSOLVER, Barbara: *Flight Behavior*. London: Harper Perennial, 2012. ISBN 9780062124272

### Acknowledgment

This work was supported by a grant of the project VEGA 1/0426/17 Ikonizácia utrpenia a jeho zmyslu v slovesnom, umeleckom a kultúrnom obraze I (Intersemiotická, interdisciplinárna a medzikultúrna rekognoskácia).

УДК 82-95

Оливия Кеннисон

Бард Колледж, отделение русского языка и литературы, Аннандэйл-на-Гудзоне, Нью-Йорк, США

### ПУШКИН И НАБОКОВ

*Аннотация.* Выполненный Владимиром Набоковым перевод «Евгения Онегина» А.С. Пушкина вызвал неоднозначную реакцию с момента публикации в 1965 году. В. Набоков, будучи неудовлетворенным

существовавшими переводами классического произведения русской поэзии, длительное время работал над собственной версией перевода, выполненной в соответствии с определёнными переводческими правилами. В статье подвергаются рассмотрению виды и правила перевода, разработанные В. Набоковым, даётся характеристика переводу и связанными с ним обстоятельствам в личной жизни писателя. Подчёркивается значимость перевода В. Набокова для литературоведения, делается акцент на научном, а не развлекательном характере работы.

**Ключевые слова:** Владимир Набоков, Александр Пушкин, перевод, Евгений Онегин, русская литература.

**Olivia Kennison**

*Bard College, Department of Russian Language and Literature, Annandale-on-Hudson, New York, USA*

## **NABOKOV'S 'MONSTROUS' PUSHKIN**

**Abstract.** Vladimir Nabokov's translation of Pushkin's *Eugene Onegin* has been controversial since its publication in 1965. Nabokov was unsatisfied with all the English translations of the classic Russian poem, and worked for decades on his own version, which he created according to his own particular set of translation rules. In this article, the translation types and guidelines designated by Nabokov are described, and then the translation he produced and the personal drama that came along with it are discussed. Ultimately, Nabokov produced an important literary document, but its purpose is not to entertain, but to educate.

**Key words:** Vladimir Nabokov, Alexander Pushkin, translation, Eugene Onegin, Russian literature.

Alexander Pushkin and Vladimir Nabokov – two of the finest Russian writers and poets, one born almost exactly a century after the other. Nabokov's frustration at the quality of the English translation of Pushkin's novel in verse *Eugene Onegin* spurred him to translate his own version, which would differ from all the others due to the meticulous set of rules it followed. The endeavor of translating the work of Russia's most beloved poet began as a partnership between Nabokov and his colleague and friend Edmund Wilson, though their friendship did not survive the publication. Wilson reviewed the first edition of Nabokov's *Onegin* for the *New York Review of Books* in 1965. Here's how the review begins:

"This production, though in certain ways valuable, is something of a disappointment; and the reviewer, though a personal friend of Mr. Nabokov – for whom he feels a warm affection sometimes chilled by exasperation – and an admirer of much of his work, does not propose to mask his disappointment. Since Mr. Nabokov is in the habit of introducing any job of this kind which he undertakes by an announcement that he is unique and incomparable and that everybody else who has attempted it is an oaf and an ignoramus, incompetent as a linguist and scholar, usually with the implication that he is also a low-class person and a ridiculous personality, Nabokov ought not to complain if the reviewer does not hesitate to underline his weaknesses."

Wilson was not alone in his criticism of Nabokov's translation. This widely disliked edition has been described as ponderous, clumsy, and joyless. Why was a this translation, undertaken by a writer whose literary command of Russian and English is unsurpassed and greatly admired, whose writing style is usually elegant and charming, such a dismal flop?

To answer this question, we must understand Nabokov's intentions. The purpose of his translation was to provide a scholarly, contextually accurate rendering of Pushkin's words and meaning. Isn't that what most translations are, you might ask? Not according to Nabokov. In the introduction to his *Eugene Onegin*, Nabokov identifies three types of translation. The first, which he calls paraphrastic, is a "free version of the original, with omissions and additions prompted by exigencies of form, the conventions attributed to the consumer, and the translator's ignorance." The second, lexical, "is the basic meaning of words (and their order)." The third, literal, is "rendering, as closely as the associative and syntactical capacities of another language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original. Only this is true translation." You can guess which one Nabokov utilized in his work. The literal method is similar to lexical translation, but understands the text in a much more complex way, including connotative and contextual meanings. It demands a thorough and comprehensive understanding of the original language and the one it will be translated into, as well as the cultural and literary traditions attending them. Nabokov set incredibly high standards for true translation and produced a remarkable work, but does this translation reach his own standards?

Here are two versions of the same verse in the first chapter of *Eugene Onegin*, the first from a translation by Peter E. Falen, published in 1995.

As all applaud, Onegin enters –  
And treads on toes to reach his seat;  
His double glass he calmly centres

On ladies he has yet to meet.  
 He takes a single glance to measure  
 These clothes and faces with displeasure;  
 Then trading bows of every side  
 With men he knew or friends he spied,  
 He turned at last and vaguely fluttered  
 His eyes toward the stage and play –  
 Then yawned and turned his head away:  
 “It’s time for something new,” he muttered,  
 “I’ve suffered ballets long enough,  
 But now Didelot is boring stuff.”

This is an example of paraphrastic translation. Falen has chosen to translate the verse while sticking to Pushkin’s meter of iambic tetrameter. Of course, we know he has taken certain liberties from the original to ensure a rhyme or maintain rhythm. Though his early attempts utilize this meter, Nabokov eventually decided that the restrictions of a meter would prevent accurate translation. Here is Nabokov’s rendering of the same verse, using his method of literal translation:

All clap as one. Onegin enters:  
 He walks – on people’s toes – between the stalls;  
 Askance, his double lorgnette trains  
 Upon the loges of strange ladies;  
 He has scanned all the tiers;  
 He has seen everything, faces, garb,  
 He’s dreadfully displeased;  
 With men on every side  
 He has exchanged salutes; then at the stage  
 In great abstraction he has glanced,  
 Has turned away, and yawned,  
 And uttered: “Time all were replaced;  
 Ballets I’ve long endured,  
 But even of Didelot I’ve had enough.”

It is clear how the lack of rhythm changes the effect of the verse. However, we are meant to believe that no words or meanings have been altered or lost in the translation. Falen’s translation is more pleasant to the ear, but for the serious scholar of Pushkin, one cannot trust that his version in any way resembles the original. Nabokov’s serves little to no poetic purpose, but preserves Pushkin’s order and meaning, what Nabokov calls the “truth” of the verse. It seems that these translations serve two entirely separate purposes: work and pleasure.

In Wilson’s review, quoted at the beginning of this article, he focuses on Nabokov’s persistent usage of odd and occasionally obsolete English vocabulary in his translation. In Nabokov’s effort to accurately reproduce Pushkin’s vocabulary, he chose words that are not found in the typical English speaker’s vernacular, and can only be found in the dark recesses of the Oxford English Dictionary. He uses, for example, the terms *producement*, *curvate*, *habitude*, *rummers*, *familistic*, *gloam*, *dit*, *shippon* and *scrab*. Wilson took the opportunity to mock his former friend’s grasp on English and ran with it. Nabokov, though he fired back at Wilson both by letter and in the next edition of the New York Review of Books, was also unsatisfied with his work. The edition finally published in 1964 was the “fifth or sixth completed version” that he made. He complained to his sister about how he hoped to “finally, finally, finally, be finished with [his] monstrous Pushkin.” In reality, he was nowhere near finished. These are pages from *Eugene Onegin* annotated by our friend, with notes from as late as 1971. Nabokov submitted a revised revision in 1967, which, inexplicably, was not published until 1975.

The work Nabokov produced at the end of decades of labor and revision is, fundamentally, a guide to the interior of *Eugene Onegin*. His goal was not to provide a pleasant reading experience for English speakers curious about Russian literature; he clearly had nothing but disdain for that concept. His extensive notes alongside the text have proved to be the most valuable element of the translation. Peter Falen writes in that “most of the poetry is resident in this accompanying commentary rather than in the translation itself. Pushkin loses where Nabokov gains.” Nabokov, who read Pushkin for the first time as a child at his family’s estate outside of St. Petersburg, cares too deeply about Pushkin to treat *Eugene Onegin* as anything other than a precious artifact. Nabokov is not only a writer, he is a scientist. He transferred Pushkin painstakingly and methodically into English and attached a comprehensive guide of footnotes and notation that explain every allusion and detail that would be entirely lost upon a non-Russian reader. For every poem or novel

referenced in Pushkin's verse, Nabokov provides the author, cultural context, stanza, rhyme scheme, and, of course, his own opinion on the work. He expands even on any flora or fauna mentioned, though that may be more out of his personal interest than regard for our own. He describes at length the beauty of Pushkin's rhythm and tempo, assuring us that any dissonance in his version is absent in the original. In his own words, "To my ideal of literalism I sacrificed everything (elegance, euphony, clarity, good taste, modern usage, and even grammar) that the dainty mimic prizes higher than truth." He goes on to say Pushkin likened translators to the horses changed at the posthouses of civilization, and that he, Nabokov, can only hope that students use his version of Eugene Onegin as a pony. So what is the value of Nabokov's efforts? A student picking up his version will probably not be inspired by the beauty of the verse. But this copy of *Eugene Onegin* is the closest any of us will get to having Nabokov as a professor.

### References

1. Pushkin, Aleksandr Sergeevich and Vladimir Vladimirovich Nabokov. *Eugene Onegin: A Novel in Verse*. [Princeton, N.J.]: Princeton University Press, 1975. Bollingen series: 72.
2. Pushkin, Aleksandr Sergeevich and James E. Folen. *Eugene Onegin: A Novel in Verse*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1995. The world's classics.

УДК 81-13

Е.В. Литвиненко

*Университет им. Лоранда Этвёша, г. Будапешт, Венгрия*

## ДОМИНИРУЮЩИЕ МОТИВЫ В ИЗУЧЕНИИ ВТОРОГО ЯЗЫКА

*Аннотация.* Мотивация является одним из основных факторов, влияющих на изучение иностранного языка. Статья посвящена вопросам внутренней и внешней мотивации и их отличительной характеристике. Это позволяет пролить свет на лингвистические и образовательные практики. В данном обзоре мы предлагаем шесть групп мотивов: внутренние мотивы, внешние мотивы, познавательные мотивы, мотивы перспективы, социальные мотивы, мотивы достижения успеха. Используя данные группы мотивов, можно изучить доминирующие мотивы, которые помогут определить уровень мотивации школьников и студентов, изучающих иностранный язык. Выявление предпочтений студентами доминирующих мотивов является ключевым элементом для планирования учебной деятельности, а также для учителей и преподавателей с целью ее организации и коррекции.

**Ключевые слова:** мотив, мотивация, изучение второго языка.

E.V. Litvinenko

*Ets Lomd University, Budapest, Hungary*

## DOMINANT MOTIVES IN SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING

*Abstract.* Motivation has been identified as one of the key factors which influence second language learning. The paper focuses on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and the distinction between them which reveals important features in both linguistic and educational practices. In this review we suggest 6 groups of motives: intrinsic motives, extrinsic motives, cognitive motives, perspective motives, social motives, motives of achieving success. Following these motives, dominant motives can be examined which may help to identify levels of students' motivation in the foreign language learning process. Identifying the preferences of students' dominant motives is a key element for planning of learning activity and for teachers with the purpose of its organization and correction.

**Key words:** motive, motivation, second language learning.

In the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the interests of researchers clearly have moved into the sphere of motivation, giving primary attention to the relationship between second language learning and learning motivation. Success or failure of a language learner is the most generated and versatile way for investigation of L2 motivation [10, c. 53]. One area for research that will fill a gap in the current literature on motivation in foreign language learning is "Dominant motives in second language learning". L2 motivation is defined as the extent of strives and motives to learn the language because of a desire to achieve a goal or satisfaction in this activity [4, c. 44].

The relevance of this study is caused, on the one hand, by updating educational content, underlining