

Tamara Brzostowska-Tereszkiewicz
Instytut Badań Literackich PAN w Warszawie

**TRANSLATORS' THUNDERING VOICES
VLADIMIR MAYAKOVSKY'S *NASH MARSH*
IN POLISH AND ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS**

In his essay on the “natural selection of translation” published on the threshold of Polish socialist realism, Seweryn Pollak raised the question of the compatibility between the ideology expressed in the source text and the one represented by the translator, the rewriter’s ideological identification with the original text-producer being a determinant for the selection of source texts to be rendered¹. Andre Lefevere, one of the leading Translation School scholars and the main initiator of the “Manipulation School,” elaborated this dependence further:

If some rewritings are inspired by ideological motivations, or produced under ideological constraints, depending on whether rewriters find themselves in agreement with the dominant ideology of their time or not, other rewritings are inspired by poetological motivations, or produced under poetological constraints².

Perhaps their theses are nowhere as thoroughly substantiated as in the study of the Mayakovsky “processed” by subsequent generations of Polish poets: the cabaret Mayakovsky carnivalized by “Skamander”, purged by the Polish futurists, re-constructed by the Cracow Avant-garde, revolutionized by the Proletarian poets of 1925 and, finally, rewritten by the “Pimpled” (“Pryszczaci”) in the 1960s. Each time the selection of texts to be rendered was necessarily impinged by the translators’ ideological and poetological stances³. Paradoxically enough, each of the representatives of such dif-

¹ S. Pollak: *O tzw. doborze naturalnym przekładu*. „Odrodzenie” 1947 № 14/15, p. 6. The concept of translation as rewriting has been introduced by A. Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London—New York: Routledge 1992.

² A. Lefevere: *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*..., p. 7.

³ See W. Parniewski: *Majakowski — fascynacja i opór*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Łódzkie 1981; E. Balcerzan: *Czy istnieje polski Majakowski?* In his: *Oprócz głosu. Szkice krytycznolite-*

ferentiated poetic schools and political stances could find something for themselves in Mayakovsky's poetry, whether extolling, epigonus-like imitating, questioning or even rebelling against his poetic manner and ideology in their polemical rewritings.

Unquestionably, the translator's affiliation for or a polemical attitude towards an ideological/ poetological stance of the author is not the sole factor governing the selection and production of literary translations which are to function in the target cultural polysystem. According to Lefevere, powerful mechanisms of patronage are also not to be overestimated as introducing constraints on both form and subject matter, ensuring economic provision for rewriters, bestowing status and praises on them and determining the ways in which a literary system develops⁴. There is no denying that the institution of patronage has always been the motor force behind processes resulting in the acceptance or rejection, canonization or non-canonization of literary works and their authors. These non-literary factors are frequently taken to extremes in totalitarian countries; Mayakovsky functioning in the Soviet bloc literatures being the example *contre coeur*.

The ideology comprised in Mayakovsky's *oeuvre* not infrequently caused his poems to sink into political paraphrase, made them particularly sensitive to interpretive abuses and, consequently, prone to translatory manipulations. Its vicissitudes can be traced easily in *Наш марш* and its Polish and English rewritings.

Written immediately after the Bolsheviks' seizure of the Winter Palace, 1917, this metaphorically dense, spondee lyric has been received as a suggestive expression of the revolutionary euphoria of the leftist Russian intelligentsia⁵, "the first joy of victory"⁶, although its reception was considerably less enthusiastic than the Marxist appraisal of the straightforwardly ideological pro-Bolshevik *Левой марш* (1918) for example. For, "it was not without reason that Vladimir Il'ich [Lenin] did not like this poem, [i.e. *Наш марш*] and interpreted it not as 'our' communist march, but as a march of the 'leftist' artists"⁷. Since it was the propaganda and political, persuasive usefulness of poetry that served as a fundamental gauge of its artistic value in the Soviet

rackie. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy 1971, pp. 271—278; A. Legeżyńska: *Tłumacz i jego kompetencje autorskie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN 1999, pp. 82—152.

⁴ See A. Lefevere: *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame...*, pp. 16, 20—24.

⁵ *Historia literatury rosyjskiej XX wieku*. Ed. A. Drawicz. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN 1997, p. 199.

⁶ Е. Усиевич: *Владимир Маяковский. Очерк жизни и творчества*. Москва: Художественная литература 1950, p. 68.

⁷ Е. Усиевич: *Владимир Маяковский...*, p. 70.

era, both the ideological and poetological content of *Наш марш* have been frequently questioned as politically indefinite, indirect, excessively ambiguous and metaphorically condensed, stylistically multiple, inconceivable and elusive in their *recherché* futurist form⁸. Treating *Наш марш* as an irrefutable proof that Mayakovsky “did not adopt the new content immediately”⁹, Elena Usievich provides such a laconic (but remarkable enough) critique of the poem:

It is a poetic and musical declaration of sprightliness but its sources and aims remain covert. [...] The symbolic conventionality of the poetic base is absolutely clear. The images are generalised to excess, devoid of the necessary material derived from real life and the sophistication of similes manifests their ‘literary character’, which Mayakovsky did not like himself¹⁰.

However, it was precisely *Наш марш* which first attracted the attention of prominent party officials and initiated a series of Mayakovsky’s flamboyant revolutionary poems ranging from astringent criticism of bourgeois society to lyrical *comptes rendus* of the current party line on a number of domestic and foreign political issues. As Andrey Sinyavsky has pointed out in his essay *О социалистическом реализме [On Socialist Realism]*, Mayakovsky “was the only Soviet poet to create a style fully in tune with, and expressive of, the new epoch”¹¹. Mayakovsky confirms that for him as well for the other Moscow Kubo-futurists: “Принимать или не принимать? Такого вопроса [...] не было. Моя революция”¹². It was their Revolution and, most emphatically, their own Communist and Futurist march:

Наш марш

Бейте в площади бунтов топот!
Выше, гордых голов гряда!
Мы разливом второго потопа
перемоем миров города.

Дней бык пег.
Медленна лет арба.
Наш бог бег.
Сердце наш барабан.
Есть ли наших золот небесней?

⁸ See Усиевич: *Владимир Маяковский...*, pp. 68–70.

⁹ Усиевич: *Владимир Маяковский...*, p. 68.

¹⁰ Усиевич: *Владимир Маяковский...*, pp. 68–70.

¹¹ M. Hayward: *Writers in Russia: 1917–1978*. Ed. by and with an Introduction of P. Blake. Preface by L. Schapiro. London: Harvill Press 1983, pp. 54–55.

¹² В. Маяковский: *Я сам*. In his: *Полное собрание сочинений в 12 томах*. Т. 12. Москва: Художественная литература 1939, p. 26.

Нас ли сжалит пули оса?
Наше оружие — наши песни.
Наше золото — звенящие голоса.

Зеленью ляг, луг,
выстели дно дням.
Радуга, дай дуг
лет быстролётным коням.

Видите, скушно звезд небу!
Без него наши песни вьем.
Эй, Большая Медведица! требуй,
чтоб на небо нас взяли живьем.

Радости пей! Пой!
В жилах весна разлита.
Сердце, бей бой!
Грудь наша — медь литавр¹³.

As early as in 1918 the poetic text was accompanied with music. Thenceforth the revolutionary song was frequently performed during October celebrations by army brass bands in Moscow and Leningrad squares¹⁴. However, the literary fame of the Revolution's uncrowned poet-laureate has not been everlasting and unflinching. Bitterly condemned by orthodox Marxist critics for committing "politically incorrect" suicide (1930), it was possible to re-enthroned him in the pantheon of Russian poets only when Stalin unexpectedly announced in „Литературная газета” that he “was and remains the best and most talented poet of our Soviet epoch. Indifference to his memory and his work should be considered a crime”¹⁵. Stalin's patronizing remark set off an avalanche of reprints and translations of Mayakovsky, on which Boris Pasternak lucidly commented: “he began to be introduced forcibly, like potatoes under Catherine the Great. This was his second death; he had no hand in it”¹⁶. Indeed translating became a political act¹⁷ and an ideological confession.

¹³ В. Маяковский: *Наши марши*. In his: *Полное собрание сочинений в 12 томах...*, Т. 2, pp. 23–24.

¹⁴ See В. Маяковский: *Полное собрание сочинений в 12 томах...*, Т. 2, p. 549.

¹⁵ Qtd. by С.М. Bowra: *Poetry and Politics 1900—1960*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1966, p. 111.

¹⁶ В. Pasternak: *An Essay in Autobiography*. Trans. by M. Harari. London: Collins and Harvill Press 1959, p. 103; qtd by С.М. Bowra, *Poetry and Politics 1900—1960...*, p. 111.

¹⁷ *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Ed. by R. Alvarez, M. Carmen-Africa Vidal. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters 1996, p 1.

Actively participating in modelling the centre of the polysystems¹⁸ and filling the literary vacuum in the target cultures of the Soviet bloc, the majority of translations of Mayakovsky were indeed a phenomenon created within the parameters set by the patrons ensuring that "the literary system does not fall too far out of step with the other subsystems society consists of"¹⁹. It was under the ideological auspices of socialist realism when three selected Polish renditions of Mayakovsky's *Наш марш* were reprinted and introduced anew in a new compiled Polish collection of his works (Witold Wandurski's rewriting was not included in this publication of 1957):

Nasz Marsz

Bijcie o place łoskot kopyt!
Wyżej ark tryumfalnych wjazd!
My zalewem drugiego potopu
przepłuczemy gardziele miast!

Byk dni zleął.
Żmudny jest lat trakt!
Nasz bóg — bieg!
Serce to bębna takt!

Kogo z nas kuli ukąsi osa?
Komu chleptać krwi naszej barszcz?
Nasze złoto — dzwoniące głosy!
Nasze kule — zwycięski marsz!

Zieleń strzygł plug.
Ściele się dno dniom.
Tęczo, daj luk —
Snom szybkołotnym dom!

Widzicie — więdną gwiazd żądła!
Z pieśni urasta nasz most.
Hej — Niedźwiedzico Wielka, żądaj —
Niech do nieba biorą nas wprost!

Radość — rytm rąk!
Niebo — czerwony dach!
Serce bij w gong!
Pierś nasza — miedź blach!

(trans. B. Jasieński²⁰)

¹⁸ See I. Even-Zohar: *The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem*. In: *Literature and Translation. New Perspectives in Literary Studies with a Basic Bibliography of Books on Translation Studies*. Ed. by J. Holmes, J. Lambert, R. von den Broeck. Leuven, Belgium: Acco 1978.

¹⁹ A. Lefevere: *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame...*, p. 14.

²⁰ W. Majakowski: *Poezje*. Ed. M. Jastrun et al. Warszawa: Czytelnik 1957, p. 94.

Nasz Marsz

Bijcie o place buntów łopot!
 Grzędą czoł sięgnijcie do gwiazd!
 My zalewem drugiego potopu
 Przepluczemy arterie miast.

Byk dni mruk
 Arba powolnych lat.
 Bieg — nasz bóg.
 Serce — to bębna takt.

Kto nasze złoto błękitem przelśni?
 Czy kule potną nas żądłem os?
 Naszym orężem — nasze pieśni.
 Naszym jest złotem — rozdzwaniający się głos.

Ziele łąk, do nóg
 Ściel się pod dno dniom.
 Tęczu, pęcznij w łuk,
 Koniom bystrym lot — grom.

Spójrzcie no, gwiazdom nieba cni się!
 Bez nich splatamy naszą pieśń.
 Hej, Niedźwiedzico Wielka! Niech dzisiaj
 Żywcem raczą na niebo nas wznieść

Radości, śpiew kuj!
 Wiosna opływa żył sieć.
 Serce bij na bój!
 Pierś — litaurów miedź!

(trans. A. Ważyk²¹)

Nasz Marsz

Bijcie w ulice buntów tupotem!
 Łby zadzierzyste – w zwarty rząd!
 My zalewem wtórego potopu
 Zmyjemy z miast odwieczny trąd!

Dni byk włókł
 Zbyt wolno brykę lat.
 Dziś bieg — bóg!
 Serce wybębnia nam takt.

Czyż nasza młodość niebem nie lśni?
 Kul się ulękniem — ukąszeń os?

²¹ In the work cited above, p. 95.

Naszym orężem — nasze pieśni,
Złoto najszczerze — rozdzwoniony głos!

Rwij ziel z łąk,
Dniom naszym dno ścieł!
Tęczo! Zataczaj krąg,
Daj koniom lotu cel!

Spójrz! Niebo gwiazdne nudnie wygląda.
Bez nieba raźniej śpiewać wciąż!
Hej! Niedźwiedzico Wielka! – żądaj.
Kaź nas do nieba żywcem wziąć.

Śpiewaj i radość pij!
Wiosennie zagrała nam płeć!
Serce! Do boju bij
W pieśń naszą — kotłów miedź!
(trans. by W. Wandurski²²)

Nasz Marsz

Na place uderzaj, buntów stopo,
Wyżej, grzędę wyniosłych czół
My zalewem drugiego potopu
Z świata miast omyjemy muł.

Dni byk włókl
Zaprzęg powolnych lat.
Bieg — nasz bóg.
Serce — to bębna takt.

Jakież złoto z naszym zrówieścić?
Kule utnąż nas rojem os?
Naszą bronią są nasze pieśni,
Naszym złotem dźwięczący głos.

Zieleń łąk — maj
Ściele nam dno dni.
Tęczo, łuk daj!
Bystry tabunie, mknij!

Widzicie, nuda w gwiazd niebie.
Bez niego nam pieśni wić.
Niedźwiedzico Wielka, do ciebie
Żywcem w niebo rozkaż się wzbic!

Radość piej, pój!
Wiosna tętni w nas krwią!

²² "Nowa Kultura" 1923, № 1, p. 16.

Serce, grzmij, bój!
 Piersi nasze — miedź trąb.
 (trans. by W. Broniewski²³)

As many as four Polish translations have been quoted to demonstrate various strategies adopted by translators who sought to reinforce the canonized Russian poet in the cache of cultural capital available to Polish culture and confined Mayakovsky's poetics to stylistic stereotype commonly known as "mayakovshchina". The application of James Holmes' method of "mapping"²⁴ based on the direct and simultaneous confrontation of a number of translations in order to detect and explicate translatory manipulations that took place in target texts proves particularly prolific. The "map" of translations of Mayakovsky's lyric can be enriched by two English rewritings published autonomously and a fragment of a translation incorporated into Victor Shklovsky's literary and biographical discourse about "Mayakovsky and his Circle" in order to provide an accurate multilingual corpora revealing numerous manipulative poetological and ideological factors operating in literary translations:

Our March

Beat the tramp of revolt in the square!
 Up, row of proud heads!
 We will wash every city in the world
 With the surging waters
 Of a second Flood.

The bull of the days is skewbald.
 The cart of the years is slow.
 Our god is speed.
 The heart is our drum.

Is there a gold more heavenly than ours?
 Can the wasp of a bullet sting us?
 Our songs are our weapons;
 Ringing voices — our gold.

Meadows, be covered with grass,
 Spread out a ground for the days.
 Rainbow, harness
 The fast-flying horses of the years.

²³ W. Majakowski: *Poezje...*, p. 93.

²⁴ See J. Holmes: *On Matching and Making Maps: From a Translator's Notebook*. In his: *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*, Amsterdam: Rodopi 1988.

See, the starry heaven is bored!
We weave our songs without its help.
Hey, you. Great Bear, demand
That they take us up to heaven alive!

Drink joys! Sing!
Spring flows in our veins.
Beat to battle, heart!
Our breast is a copper kettledrum.
(trans. by D. Obolensky²⁵)

Our March

Slog brute streets with rebel tramping!
Higher, the crags of haughty heads!
We will wash all the planets' cities
In the surge of a second flood.

Pied days, these.
Slow drags the dray of years.
Our god's speed.
Our hearts are drums.

Who can match the glow of our golds?
Will the waspy bullets bite?
We strike back with songs for weapons.
Massive gold — our thundering voices.

Lacquer the lawn, green,
Carpet the days, grass,
Harness the quick years, sky,
Under a rainbow yoke.

Look at heaven, gaping with boredom:
We have shut it out from our songs.
Hey, Great Dipper, demand
That they hoist us to heaven alive.

Drink to joy! Shout!
Spring has flooded our blood.
Heart, exult, beat!
Our breasts are as crashing brass.
(trans. by B. Deutsch and A. Yarmolinsky²⁶)

²⁵ D. Obolensky: *The Heritage of Russian Verse*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press 1965, pp. 372—373.

²⁶ M. Van Doren: *An Anthology of World Poetry*. New York: Albert and Charles Boni 1928, p. 1020.

Our March

Beat on the squares the tramp of revolt
 Up higher the ridge of proud heads!
 With the tide of the second flood
 We will wash over the cities of the world.

The bull of days is piebald
 Slow is the cart of years.
 Speed is our God.
 The heart is our drum.

(trans. by L. Feiler²⁷)

Both the Polish and English rewritings of Mayakovsky's revolutionary *Наш марш* constitute eloquent examples of the combination of ideological and poetological motivations and constraints governing the production of literary translations and thus serve as unambiguous evidence supporting the Manipulation School's assumptions. The rewritings of Mayakovsky's poem constitute polemical translations, which have been defined by Anton Popovič as texts in which the translator's operations are intentionally directed against another translator's tactics, which is representative of an antagonistic ideological, poetological and interpretive translatory conception. It can be seen from the present comparative analysis that the rewritings of Witold Wandurski and Władysław Broniewski emerged precisely as a reaction towards Bruno Jasiński's translation. Moreover, some of the rewritings of Mayakovsky have been also devised as a polemic against some aspects of his poetics and intended to bring the original up to date. Jasiński's rendition illustrates this phenomenon most clearly.

For the Polish Futurists, Bruno Jasiński and Anatol Stern, Mayakovsky was primarily a futurist and, according to Edward Balcerzan, they both strived to subject Mayakovsky to a specific "futuristic 'purge'" and wished to perceive him "as a 'truer' futurist, than he really was in his works"²⁸. Remarkably enough, in his preface to the collection of Polish translations of Mayakovsky, Stern states his grievances against a number of non-futuristic denizens in Mayakovsky's poetry and wants to refine his literary work from such impurities as Filippo Tommaso Marinetti's influence, "symbolist and decadent grease", idealistic romanticism and an extravagant technical virtuosity²⁹. Balcerzan elucidates that the strategy of futurists was motivated

²⁷ V. Shklovsky: *Mayakovsky and His Circle*. Ed. and trans. by L. Feiler. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company 1972, pp. 98—99.

²⁸ E. Balcerzan: *Oprócz głosu...*, p. 272.

²⁹ W. Majakowski: *Wybór poezji w przekładach Broniewskiego, Jasińskiego, Słobodnika, Słonimskiego, Sterna, Tuwima, Wandurskiego poprzedzony wstępem Majakowskiego do*

by their passionate desire to achieve a pure, homogeneous and solid vision of Mayakovsky, which would be futurist *par excellence*. Therefore they condemned those stylistic devices that blurred the clearness of the idealistic image of Mayakovsky as a master of futurists worldwide. However, their translatory practices totally contradicted their theoretical and programmatic statements and thus the futurists' "hunting for [...] modernist heresies of Mayakovsky" paradoxically coincided with saturating the translations of his poems "with the same, or even 'worse' modernist stylistics"³⁰. Hence numerous poeticised amplifications vivid in Jasiński's *Nasz Marsz*: additional epithets ("ark tryumfalnych", "zwycięski marsz", "sny szybkolotne", "czerwony dach"), *recherche* metaphors: avant-garde "gardziele miast", turpist-like "krwi barszcz", expressionist "gwiazd żądła". Needless to say, the Mayakovsky "constructed" by the Polish futurists functioned as the "real" Mayakovsky for the Polish readers in the inter-war period, even though Jasiński and Stern unabashedly rewrote those verses of the Russian poet that they considered not futurist enough. According to Balcerzan, Jasiński's translations of Mayakovsky constituted "an argument between two futurists about futurism"³¹ and thus were a blatant example of a translation conceived as a terrain of poetological and ideological polemics. For, translation is always tension between the precise idiom of the original and the very personal idiom of the rewriter.

Contrary to the Polish futurists' translations, Wandurski's version "tones down some aspects of Mayakovsky's futurist poetics"³² in favour of romantic overtones and thus becomes an eulogy ardently extolling revolutionary youth ("Łby zadzierzyste"), its impatience, life force, even sexual urge ("Wiosennie zagrała nam płeć!") and aggressive impetus reminiscent of the ideology displayed in Adam Mickiewicz's *Oda do Młodości* [*Ode to Youth*], a poem programmatic not only for the generation of Polish Romantic poets. Wandurski introduces an image of youth ("młodość") for the original ambiguous and metaphoric "золота" in the rhetorical question: "Есть ли наших золот небесней?" and rewrites: "Czyż nasza młodość niebem nie lśni?". Seen in this contextual light, "Kul się ulękniem — ukąszeń os?" ("Нас ли сжалит пули оса?") acquires a tone of irony, youthful haughtiness and bravado.

polskiego czytelnika, jego autobiografią oraz przedmową Sterna, Warszawa: "Książka" 1927, p. 15.

³⁰ E. Balcerzan: *Oprócz głosu...*, p. 272.

³¹ E. Balcerzan: *Tłumaczenie poetyckie wśród kontekstów historycznoliterackich (polski Majakowski)*. In: *Prace z poetyki poświęcone VI Międzynarodowemu Kongresowi Słowistów*. Ed. M. R. Mayenowa, J. Sławiński, Warszawa: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich 1968, p. 38.

³² W. Parniewski: *Majakowski — fascynacja i opór...*, p. 146.

Wandurski's rendition and Jasieński's polemical rewriting thus differ in terms of degree of "futurisation". While Jasieński's text has been heavily modernized and updated, the latter resorts to the Polish romantic paradigm and constitutes a classical example of reinforcing dominant cultural codes via translation. Mayakovsky's agitational ode changes in Wandurski's rewriting into a song of exultation, extolling the romantic rebellion of belligerent, cantankerous youth instead of the Bolshevik revolutionary movement, which has been considered by the Russian futurists as homogeneous and consistent with their powerful, impetuous and subversive artistic movement in Russian Avant-garde.

The Polish Mayakovsky rewritten by Wandurski and Broniewski, both representing the Polish proletarian and revolutionary poets, emerged as a literary phenomenon filling the cultural vacuum in the Polish target polysystem. For, "it is clear that the very principles of selecting the works to be translated are determined by the situation governing the polysystem: the texts are picked according to their compatibility with the new approaches [...]"³³. The "updated" Mayakovsky of the co-authors of *Trzy Salwy* (*Three Salvoes*), 1925 illustrates not only the translators' personal ideological agreement to the Russian poet's stance, but also the historical ideological identification of the whole generation of Polish inter-war revolutionary poets. *Hau mapu* became a programmatic statement of proletarian poets performing a heroic march for enthroning proletarian poetry in the inter-war literary canon and striving for the consolidation of leftist ideology. Therefore, the rewritings produced by the Polish revolutionary poets were maintained in the same rhetoric convention of heroisation of the revolutionists as introduced in the translators' own poetic practices and thus might be said to perform a compensative function as the rewriters' own potential voice. Broniewski's synecdoche "buntów stopa" ("бунтов топот") conveys the image of an ideological community, solidarity, homogeneity and monolithic constitution of all united revolutionary movements. The amplified and updated image of spring "Zieleń łąk — maj/ Ściele nam dno dni", "Wiosna tętni w nas krwią" suggestively conveys the revolutionary enthusiasm of Polish Proletarian poets considering Mayakovsky as "the greatest poet of the world's greatest Revolution"³⁴. The use of home idiomatic speech and specifically Polish colloquial phraseology in both Broniewski's and Wandurski's rewritings (e.g. "wziąć żywcem", "szczerze złoto", "łby", "włókl brykę") increases the effect of ideological identity of the source and target cultures and strengthens the texts' persuasive power.

³³ I. Even-Zohar: *The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem...*, p. 121.

³⁴ Qtd. by W. Parniewski: *Majakowski — fascynacja i opór...*, p. 154.

The rhetorical impact of the Polish Mayakovsky has been also achieved by Bruno Jasiński who introduced numerous additional futurist exclamations (six in Mayakovsky's poem vis-à-vis fifteen in the Polish translation). A similar strategy has been adopted in Babette Deutsch and Avrahm Yarmolinsky's rewriting, where Mayakovsky's scream is considerably amplified, which constitutes one of the popular techniques of constructing "mayakovshchina"³⁵. The translators strengthen the lexical expression of the original and propose hyperbolised "massive gold — our thundering voices" as an equivalent for the mildly lyrical "Наше золото — звенящие голоса", which has been preserved by Dimitri Obolensky ("Ringing voices"), Wandurski ("rozdzwoniony głos"), Broniewski ("dźwięczący głos") and Adam Ważyk ("rozdzwaniający się głos"). "Shout!" instead of the original "Пой!" ("Sing!", "śpiewaj", "piej", "śpiew kuj"), "Heart, exult, beat!" ("Сердце, бей", strong "Serce, grzmij" in Broniewski's translation) and an introduction of onomatopoeic sounds: "Our breasts are as crashing brass" ("Грудь наша — медь литавр") also intensify the expressionist "gigantophony"³⁶ of Mayakovsky's voice, which is one of the constitutive elements of "mayakovshchina", a simplified, stereotyped understanding of Mayakovsky's poetry as "a street loudspeaker" transmitting aggressive agitating rhetorics of revolutionary and communist ideology. On the contrary, Jasiński's marching victors seem to attach greater importance to the decorations and scenery of their entry into the city, to the staging of the ceremony-performance ("gong") and its spectacular value ("Radość — rytm rąk"), theatrical effects, manner of marching ("rytm", "takt").

Updating and modernizing Mayakovsky's verses, Jasiński produced a poetic statement of an already accomplished and irreversible fact, action successfully performed and completed, purpose achieved and the opponents defeated: "Byk dni zlegl" ("Дней бык пер"), "Zieleń strzygł pług,/ ściele się dno dniom" ("Зеленью ляг, луг,/ выстели дно дням). Jasiński's victors, so to say, are summing up their achievements³⁷, they express the aggressiveness of the masters and boastfulness of the victors (amplified "zwycięski marsz"), while Mayakovsky's lyrical "we" expresses the rebels' present and future poetic and political feelings, brave aspirations, eagerness after glorious and overwhelming victory, hopeful predictions,

³⁵ See E. Balcerzan: *Literatura z literatury (strategie tłumaczy)*. Katowice: „Śląsk” 1998, pp. 101—103.

³⁶ J. Przyboś: *Najmniej słów*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie 1955, p. 158. See also E. Balcerzan: *Literatura z literatury ...*, p. 101.

³⁷ E. Balcerzan: *Bruno Jasiński a Włodzimierz Majakowski*. In: *O wzajemnych powiązaniach literackich polsko-rosyjskich. Tom poświęcony VI Międzynarodowemu Kongresowi Słowistów w Pradze*. Ed. S. Fiszman, K. Sierocka we współpracy z T. Kołakowskim. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich 1969, p. 237.

tenacity of purpose. The mutineers' faith in (not consciousness of) victory combines with a romantic need of some poetic mysticism: "Наше оружие — наши песни". Presenting his readers with a *fait accompli*, Jasiński tunes his translation to the new historical situation. Balcerzan proposes to call this phenomenon a great metonymy, a substitution of objects, which has changed under pressure of historical time for objects from the ST³⁸. Jasiński's triumphing marching victors enter a city through a triumphant arch: "ark triumfalnych wjazd" ("гордых голов гряда") and thus remind a reader of victorious Roman imperial soldiers conquering barbarian hordes. The associations with the Romans, whose architecture became an icon of the harmonious civilization of ancient times and who conquered primitive, ignorant and crude barbarians, are strengthened by Jasiński's urbanized futurist metaphors: "gardziele miast", "lat trakt", "most pieśni", "dach nieba". Jasiński's lyrical *personae* are proud, civilised victors riding horses ("łoskot kopyt") and, most emphatically, not foot rebels ("бунтов топот"). It is their ideological and aesthetic opponents who are uncouth barbarians who "chłep[czą] krwi [...] barszcz" like animals. The image of rebellion/revolt does not appear in any of Jasiński's semantic fields because "Jasiński's translation, unlike the original, is not an expression of the feelings and aspirations of the mutineers"³⁹ but a manifesto of glorious victors. Thus, the image of a massive proletarian rebellion ("бунтов топот", Wandurski's literal "buntów tupot" changed into "buntów łopot" signifying flapping Bolshevik banners in Ważyk's rewriting) turns into an image of a cavalry unit in Jasiński's translation. Broniewski's synecdoche ("buntów stopo") weakens the impression of the Revolution's tumult but emphasises solidarity, homogeneity and unity of the world's revolutionary movement instead. To the contrary, the English translations stress the rebellious and brute character of the proletarian movement and amplify the image of the uncouth marching crowd: "Beat the tramp of revolt in the square!" (Obolensky), "Beat on the square the tramp of revolt" (Feiler) and "Slog brute streets with rebel tramping!" (Deutsch and Yarmolinsky), the latter implying heroism of the revolutionary endeavour and future hardships.

Conveying hopes and strivings of the October Revolution's initial, heroic phase and implying propaganda overtones, *Наш марш* became also a manifesto of an avant-garde and rebellious poetic movement starting a revolution in the arts in the name of modernity, speed and dynamism. In his *Открытое письмо рабочим* published in the ephemeral "Газета футуристов" ("The Futurists' Newspaper") in March 1918, Mayakovsky asserted: "Революция содержания

³⁸ See E. Balcerzan: *Literatura z literatury...*, p. 52.

³⁹ In the work cited above.

— социализм-анархизм — немислима без революции формы — футуризма. [...] Одно для нас ясно — первая страница новейшей истории искусств открыта нами”⁴⁰. The revolutionary act acquires additional metaphorical and biblical features and is assigned the status of a second Flood coming to wash the worlds' cities (“Мы разливом второго потопа/ перемоем миров города”) and to introduce new socio-political and poetic order. The map of Polish and English translations reveals a range of diverse metaphorised and dramatised versions: “Przepluczemy gardziele miast” (Jasiński), “Przepluczemy arterie miast” (Ważyk), “Zmyjemy z miast odwieczny trąd” (Wandurski), “Z świata miast omyjemy muł” (Broniewski), “We will wash every city in the world” (Obolensky), “We will wash over the cities of the world” (Feiler). Deutsch and Yarmolinsky's translation acquires even a cosmic dimension: “We will wash all the planets' cities”. This interpretive diversity reflects the different writing styles, “for translation always involves that double process of reading and writing”⁴¹. Curious as it may seem, Mayakovsky's far-fetched metaphor “Дней бык пер” signifying the “piebald days” of the White Guard and the Red Guard has been omitted in all the Polish translations and replaced by an image amplifying the relation between a bull and a slow cart of days as opposed to fast-flying horses of years: “Dni byk włókl/ Zbyt wolno brykę lat” (Wandurski), “Dni byk włókl/ Zaprzęg powolnych lat” (Broniewski), “Byk dni zlegl/ Żmudny jest lat trakt!” (Jasiński) and “Byk dni mruk/ Arba powolnych lat” (Ważyk). All the proposals illustrate the translators' effort to establish spondee metre in Polish.

Proud of its innovatory and precursory achievements (“Выше, гордых голов грядя!”, “Есть ли наших золот небесней?”) the Russian futurists (and revolutionists), who regarded themselves as the vanguard of Communist culture reject the old poetic tradition and its faded guiding stars, (“Видите, скушно звезд небу!/ Без него наши песни вьем”) and demand self-ascension onto the poetic firmament as new shining and bright stars. As Mayakovsky reflected upon his literary work, there was a pathos of a socialist awareness of the necessity of destruction of the old world: „У меня — пафос социалиста, знающего неизбежность крушения старья. Родился российский футуризм”⁴². Remarkably enough, in some Polish rewritings, Mayakovsky's metaphorical negation of the “небо”, symbolizing either traditionalist art or Heaven, is disambiguated into a negation of religion, a blatant manifesto of Mayakovsky's atheism, a phenomenon thoroughly analysed by orthodox Marxist critics. Wandurski's verse “Bez nieba różnie

⁴⁰ В. Маяковский: *Открытое письмо рабочим*. In his: *Полное собрание сочинений в 12 томах...*, Т. 11, р. 81.

⁴¹ *Translating Literature*. Ed. S. Bassnett, Cambridge: D.S. Brewer 1997, p. 2.

⁴² В. Маяковский: *Я сам...*, р. 26.

śpiewać wciąż” strikes the same atheist note as Aleksandr Blok’s famous “Свобода, свобода, / Эх, эх, без креста!” (“Freedom, freedom, / Hey, hey, with no cross!” in Hackel’s rendition⁴³) extolled by twelve Red Guardsmen of *Двенадцать*. Quoting Mayakovsky’s poetic formula “Наш бор бег”, a Marxist critic authoritatively asserts that “most firmly Mayakovsky fortifies his atheist positions after October’s victory. Thereafter both his atheism and post-October poetry grow on a totally new ground and coincide with the struggle for building socialism”⁴⁴.

Bruno Jasiński’s translation strikes the same chord. In his metaphorical amplification “Niebo — czerwony dach”, the ideological meaning is disambiguated and directly explicated, carrying strong Communist overtones and leaving no doubt that the new communist religion is to reign supreme in the Bolshevik era. The apostrophe to rainbow, “Tęczo, daj łuk — / snom szybkolotnym dom” as an equivalent for the original “Радуга, дай дуг / лет быстrolётным коням” becomes an overt, explicit expression of hankering for a quick realisation of the Bolshevik utopia.

Ważyk’s reversal of stars and sky, “Spójrzcie no, gwiazdom nieba cni się! / Bez nich splatamy naszą pieśń”, conveys the unambiguous image of the fallen and useless stars longing for poetical heaven and confirms the anti-traditionalist approach of futurism as a new poetic movement, but leaving no space for an anti-religious interpretation projected in the source text. It has to be noted that Mayakovsky’s formula, “скушно звезд небу”, signifies the sky’s yearning for new stars rather than its boredom and emptiness, which have been portrayed in “See, the starry heaven is bored! / We weave our songs without its help” (Obolensky) and in Deutsch and Yarmolinsky’s “Look at heaven, gaping with boredom: / We have shut it out from our songs”, which emphasises a radical, voluntary action of the revolutionists rejecting heaven with strong anti-religious connotations. Thus, the atheist-oriented Universe of Discourse of the English rewritings also conforms to Smorodin’s highly authoritative and tendentious Marxist interpretation of Mayakovsky’s literary work as a consistent realisation of an agitatively enlightening mission aimed at the atheist education of the masses: “Mayakovsky was aware of the inseparability of the revolutionary struggle and the fight against religion. This unity of the idea of revolution and an exceptionally strong condemnation of religious views are mirrored in his poems”⁴⁵.

⁴³ S. Hackel: *The Poet and the Revolution. Aleksandr Blok’s ‘The Twelve’*. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1975, pp. 212—213.

⁴⁴ А. Смородин: *Маяковский — пропагандист атеизма*. In: *Русская литература в борьбе с религией*. Ed. Н. Степанов. Москва: Издательство Академии Наук СССР 1963, p. 333.

⁴⁵ In the work cited above.

Significantly enough, in both English translations the apostrophe to a rainbow and a request for an arch for galloping horses of the revolutionary years changes into a demand for fettering, fastening them together by laying a yoke across their heads, harnessing them and thus bringing them under control: "Rainbow, harness / the fast-flying horses of the years" (Obolensky) and "Harness the quick years, sky, / Under a rainbow yoke" (Deutsch and Yarmolinsky). While discussing the dynamic interaction between poetics, ideology and translation, Andre Lefevere firmly concluded: "On every level of the translation process, it can be shown that, if linguistic considerations enter into conflict with considerations of an ideological and/or poetological nature, the latter tend to win out"⁴⁶.

The evident verbosity of both English and Polish translations and numerous amplifications, rarely motivated in the poetics of the entire composition, serve for "creating an illusion of transparency in which linguistic and cultural differences are domesticated"⁴⁷. Revealing the considerable ideological consequences of the fundamental choice between foreignization and domestication as translation strategies, Lawrence Venuti emphasised the normalizing and neutralizing effect of the domestication technique, depriving source text producers of their voice and re-expressing foreign cultural values in terms of what is familiar (and therefore unchallenging) to the dominant culture. Mayakovsky sings revolutionary (and futurist) passions in words that march in military step. This poet's unimitable oratorical and rhetorical manner consists of short, broken lines, heavily accented single words and sentences, the stress put on intonation and meaning, the emphasis on syllabic variations of rhymes and the auditory effect of intentionally difficult articulation. Mayakovsky's spondee verse marches impetuously to the sound of drums and trumpets, whereas the English and Polish rewriters prefer a much slower pace and softer rhythms and, consequently, inevitably lose the staccato of Mayakovsky's rhythm, his sharp, brittle diction and pungent, shrill verse. The fine instrumentation, refined rhyme structure with *outré* assonances, topiary arrangements, condensation of metaphors, semantic tensions and original stylistic antinomies constituting the paradigm of Mayakovsky's poetry have been frequently stereotyped and replaced by trivial, cliché metaphors and uplifting slogans accompanied by strong pathetic accents.

The analysis of the poetological dissimilarities between the presented Polish and English translations reveals the "constructed" and "manipulated" character of the domesticated Mayakovsky and clearly illustrates clashes of various ideologies and poetics represented by particular translators. Moreo-

⁴⁶ A. Lefevere: *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame...*, p. 39.

⁴⁷ L. Venuti: *The Translator's Invisibility: a History of Translation*. London–New York: Routledge 1995, p. 34.

ver, it substantiates Lefevere's thesis that "struggles between rival poetics are often sparked off by translations, and not seldom fought also by means of translations"⁴⁸. The subsequent poetic incarnations of the Russian poet illustrate that the poet has been each time refracted to conform to prevailing artistic norms, poetological currents and ideology⁴⁹. Summing up, the Polish and English renditions of *Hau mapu* show that each of the rewriters "marched" not only in tune of their own times, but also to the accompaniment of the dominant poetological norms and ideological constraints of their target culture. The present study has been an attempt to emphasise the power of rewritings of canonized works of literature which either conform to firmly established "exclusively right" readings of the originals or challenge the "received" interpretations to bring the rewritten texts in line with the "new" dominant target poetics and the reigning ideological and political orthodoxy of their times. They shape the reception of the original in the receiving culture and manipulate the author's literary and political fame. It is also to stress the necessity for further in-depth study of the phenomenon of Russian post-Revolutionary poetry functioning in Polish and Anglo-American cultures.

Tamara Brzostowska-Tereszkiewicz

GRZMIĄCE GŁOSY TŁUMACZY.
NASZ MARSZ WŁADIMIRA MAJAKOWSKIEGO
 W PRZEKŁADACH POLSKICH I ANGIELSKICH

Streszczenie

Przedmiotem artykułu jest analiza porównawcza polskich i angielskich przekładów wiersza *Hau mapu* Władimira Majakowskiego w kontekście translatologicznych ustaleń tzw. szkoły manipulacyjnej. Konfrontacja poszczególnych przekładów rewolucyjnego utworu rosyjskiego kubofuturysty unaocznia nieuchronne zderzenia politycznych i poetyckich ideologii reprezentowanych przez tłumaczy oraz różne historyczne strategie „konstruowania” wizerunku Majakowskiego w kulturze docelowej.

⁴⁸ A. Lefevere: *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame...*, p. 50.

⁴⁹ E. Balcerzan: *Oprócz głosu...*, p. 271–278.

Тамара Бжостовска-Терешкевич

ГРЕМЯЩИЕ ГОЛОСА ПЕРЕВОДЧИКОВ. *НАШИ МАРШИ*
ВЛАДИМИРА МАЯКОВСКОГО В ПЕРЕВОДАХ НА ПОЛЬСКИЙ И АНГЛИЙСКИЙ

Резюме

Предметом настоящей статьи является сравнительный анализ польских и английских переводов стихотворения *Наши марши* Владимира Маяковского в методологических рамках т.н. школы манипуляции в западноевропейском переводеведении. Конфронтация нескольких переводов революционного сочинения русского кубофутуриста показывает неизбежные столкновения политических и поэтических идеологий переводчиков, а также разные исторические приемы конструирования образа Маяковского в принимающей культуре.