Abstract

Objectives: Significant episodes of the Russian reception of the poetry of Robert Burns are comprehended in this article, wherein the main attention is concentrated on the work of I.I. Kozlov, M.L. Mikhailov, P.I. Weinberg, S. Ya. Marshak, E.D. Feldman, who are the most authoritative interpreters of the great Scottish poet. Methods: The facts of Russian translation reception are analyzed in this article; in this connection the basic material for analyzing became the translations of the works of R. Burns into Russian made by I. I. Kozlov, M. L. Mikhailov, S. Ya. Marshak, E. D. Feldman and others. Literary-critical and literary criticism publications, as well as the factual account of memoirs, epistolary, and reference books are involved as an additional material. Findings: When considering the sources of the reception of Burnsian creative work, it is analyzed the possible motives from the works of the Scottish author in the poems of A. S. Pushkin “The Landslide” (1829) and “The Echo” (1831). In addition, it is compared the arguments “pro” and “contra,” formulated in different years by A. V. Druzhinin, N. V. Yakovlev, B. V. Tomaszewski and E. V. Vitkovsky. Another great Russian poet, M. Yu. Lermontov, was interested by the quatrain “Had we never loved so kindly” from Burns’ poem “Ae fond Kiss, and then we sever,” where when translating into Russian it was made an error: an English word “kindly” (“dearly”, “affectionately”) M. Yu. Lermontov correlated with a German word “Kind” (“a child”). Until now this fragment of translation, not intended for publication, causes debates of specialists in literature and translation studies specialists: what guided by M.Yu. Lermontov when he incorrectly interpreted a meaning of the word (purposefully or not); whether the translation “improved” or “worsen” the impression of the original; whether to consider such transformation into Russian as a translation. The author traces the stages of evolution of Russian reception of Burns’ poetry noting the most important events – free adaptations by I. I. Kozlov, very unlike the originals, but quite accurately conveying the feelings and thoughts of the translator himself; the translations made by the authors of the democratic magazines of the epoch of the reforms of Alexander II, who, the authors, discerned closeness of the Scottish poet to the lower orders, their customs and traditions. Of all the Russian translations of Burns’ works, the translations by S. Ya. Marshak are the most studied ones; S.A. Orlov, E. S. Belashova, Yu. D. Levin and others wrote on them in their articles in detail; however, even referring to them it turns out well to represent an unexpected new perspective of the subject: the S. Ya. Marshak’s translations are comprehended through the prism of their perception by A.T. Tvardovsky; thereby it is widely involved journalistic articles, diaries and letters of the Soviet poet, who as the editor in chief of one of the most popular literary magazines, “Novy Mir” (“New World”), did much to popularize the Marshakian Burns. Significant interests represent modern Russian translations of Burns, which are comprehended in this article for the first time, and first of all the translations by E.D. Feldman, who entering into correct absentee polemic with S.Ya. Marshak, managed to suggest new perusals of many works, and wherein E.D. Feldman’s perusals are characterized by depth of penetration into conceptions of the Scottish author, into his inner world. Applications/Improvements: The systematization of materials on a subject allowed to make generalizations, to form the complete idea of tendencies of development of the Russian poetic translation that will promote the solution of one of the most important problems of modern Russian literary criticism – to write the history of the Russian translated fiction.
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1. Introduction

During the first half of the XIX century the works of Burns were presented in Russian as prosaic word-for-word translations characterized by deliberate Russification, free romantic interpretations, and incompetent attempts of secondary authors to read Burns in original. The very first translation of Burns appeared in the pages of the sentimentalistic magazine “Hippocrene, or Pleasures of Word-Loving” in 1800, i.e. just four years after the death of the Scottish poet. That was “Address to the Shade of Thomson” conveyed in prose by an unascertained translator. There are preserved evidences of A.S. Pushkin’s interest to Burns. There was a two-volume edition “The Poetical Works of”¹ in the library of the great Russian poet; the first volume was cut up to page 128, where it was printed the famous poem “Stanzas to a Mountain Daisy…” In, making a remark that Robert Burns “always made a great impression upon Pushkin”, expressed an interesting observation about a poem of the Russian poet “The Landslide” (1829): “We always thought that the construction of the stanzas in “The Landslide” (purely Burnsian) is not a coincidence. Not only “The Landslide” (1829) is composed in iambic meter with a number of feet 444,242 at the male rhymes (all the tetrameter verses end in the same rhyme, whereas the dimeter verses end in another rhyme: aaaa-babb), but one more Pushkin’s poem, “The Echo” (1831). Emphasizing the attention only upon the poem “The Echo”, the researchers of the subsequent time, – at first it was N.V. Yakovlev and then B.V. Tomaszewski,³ – considered that in this case A.S. Pushkin was influenced not so much by Burns as by Barry Cornwall who borrowed from Burns his characteristic stanza by which Cornwall composed his poem “A Sea-Shore Echo.” Here’s how B.V. Tomaszewski, with certain reservations, wrote about it: “That was exactly Burns from whom Barry Cornwall borrowed this stanza, from Burns for whom this stanza was usual, whereas in Cornwall’s work it is presented only in this example. <…> Burns, as well as other English poets, did not distinguish the gender of the rhymes, and though according to the conditions and style of the English language the male rhyme dominated in his poems, sporadically he used the female rhymes as well. Throughout the entire poem “A Sea-Shore Echo” all the rhymes are the male ones. Prevalence of the male rhymes resulted in the tradition to image the coloring of the English poem in Russian translations at the expense of a strict choice of the male rhymes only. That is why Pushkin, even if he proceeded directly from the Burns’ stanzas, surely would preserve the order of the male rhymes.”⁵ Over the years, it becomes clear a certain straining of N.V. Yakovlev and B.V. Tomaszewski’s assertions, who took into consideration only “The Echo” but forgot about the poem “The Landslide” and did not pay attention to the fact that the book of Burns in the library of A.S. Pushkin was cut exactly before “Stanzas to a Mountain Daisy…,” written by a characteristic stanza; on this background, A.V. Druzhinin’s assumption who in 1855 had not even a part of the facts that are known to modern science, looks like a brilliant guess testifying to a unique philological intuition of a Russian critic. That’s what a modern translator, a compiler of publications of Burns E. V. Vitkovsky wrote about it in 1999: “It’s too great strained interpretation of Messrs Pushkinst. It’s difficult to say how much clear for Pushkin was the “Scottish” which Burns used for his poem “To a Mountain Daisy, on turning one down with the plough, in April, 1786” (by this poem the “cut” part of the Pushkin’s copy of Burns is concluded), but charming rhythm of ‘standard Habbie’ is heard and seen in itself. Scarcely likely that in 1855 A.V. Druzhinin, stating that Pushkin directly used “the Burns stanza”, knew it for sure which book from Pushkin’s library up to what page was cut; and that’s why he couldn’t present evidence that this stanza was just “the Burns” one, that’s why the next generations for the greater persuasiveness invented borrowing from Barry Cornwall.”⁶

M. Yu. Lermontov was attracted by a quatrain “Had we never loved so kindly” from a poem “Ae fond Kiss, and then we sever,” known by two names, “One Gentle Kiss” and “Loathe-to-Depart for Clarinda.” His translation “Had we never loved so kindly” proved to be not entirely accurate, because, as N.N. Bakhtin noted,⁷ a young poet (the first edition of the translation refers to the year 1830, a final edition refers to the year 1832, mixed up “kindly” (gently) and a German word “Kind” (a child).

P.M. Toper,⁸ applying to M. Yu. Lermontov’s translation that became “a pearl” of Russian poetry, noted: “It has long known that single, even the most serious errors, cannot serve themselves the evidence that the translation is bad, as well as single, even the most magnificent finds, cannot serve as an indisputable sign of a bad translation (much has been written about this).” In this connection, the following questions can be the subject of discussion: what was the motive of M. Yu. Lermontov when he wrongly interpreted the meaning of the word (was it purposely or not); whether the translation “improved” or “worsened” an impression of the script; whether such
transformation into Russian must be considered a translation or not (See 9). M. Yu. Lermontov did not intend to publish this fragment; for the first time it was published in the magazine “The Fatherland Notes” (“Otechestvenniye zapiski”) just as much in 1859.10

As can be seen, Robert Burns proved to be not only familiar, but interesting for the leading Russian writers already in the first third of the XIX century, when the translations of his works into Russian were sporadic, and – in accordance with the spirit of the times – were free so much that were rather the Russian authors’ own reflections on the theme of Burns.

Until now there is no a complete and detailed study of Russian reception of Robert Burns, but a few researchers did a great work dealing with collection and systematization of the materials, characterizing individual aspects of the scientific problem. In this connection it is necessary to mention the names of S.A. Orlov,11 E.S. Belashova,12-14 and Yu. D. Levin,15 whose works can be of great help to the scientists of later time. In our review we should mention a bibliographic work by A. N. Girivenko and A. R. Nedchina “English Literature in Russian Criticism”,16 as well; it gives sufficiently complete information on literary- critical and literary criticism perception the personality and creative work of Robert Burns in Russia. The latest works about Russian Burns went out of print in 1980-ies, i.e. about three decades ago,15,17-20 and in these decades Russia undergone global and political changes, largely predetermined, among other things, the completion of a multi-years monopoly of the translations of S. Ya. Marshak, and the appearance of new professional translations. Understanding the Burns’ texts is also supported by usage of the researches of foreign scientists and thinkers about Burns himself.21-28 Theoretically and methodologically the research is based on the fundamental works of V.M. Zhirmunsky,29 M.M. Bakhtin,30 M.P. Alekseev,31 Yu. D. Levin (Levin, 1985).17,18 as well as on the other articles devoted to the problems of literary translation, intercultural communication and to the international relations of the Russian literature. A considerable assistance in this work was rendered by the proceedings of foreign scientists and thinkers, devoted to understanding of the creative personality of R. Burns.21-28

2. Results

For his first fame among Russian readers R. Burns was obliged to a blind poet I.I. Kozlov,32 who published in 1829 in the printing house of the Department of Public Education a small book “The Cotter's Saturday Night in Scotland. A free imitation of R. Burns (sic) by I. Kozlov” that contained besides a free imitation, mentioned in the title, also a free reading of “Stanzas to a Mountain Daisy…” under the title “To the Field Daisy, which Robert Burns (sic), tilling his field, accidentally cut with iron of his sokha (a wooden plough) in April 1786”. In his free imitation “The Cotter’s Saturday Night in Scotland” an attention is drawn to such significant deviations from the original as substitution of the Burns’ dedication to Robert Aiken for the dedication to Al. An. V…va (to Alexandra Andreyevna Voyeikova, who has died by that time), where the feelings caused by the loss of the close friend are combined with bitterness of his own fate, an emergence of an additional final stanza, appealing to “holy Russia” and designed to express patriotic feelings, hope for the prosperity of the country at adherence to the laws of faith and honor, faithfulness to art, and besides to do it in the form of a prayerful appeal. In “Stanzas to a Mountain Daisy…” I.I. Kozlov33 was impressed by the desire of the Scottish poet to show the strength of love and a human powerlessness of destiny; using lyrical exclamations, he expressly desired to stress his regrets about inevitability of evil destiny and repentance for what happened (“O crimson, field flower! / You, my poor, met me/Not in a good hour: I cut you in the heyday. / The pearl of glens, / I can’t save you!” The important feature of the Kozlov's retellings became their saturation with religious motifs, reasoning about obedience to the high will that conformed to mentality of a blind singer himself more than to the thoughts of Burns.

The appearance of the book stroke a response of N.A. Polevoy,34 who in his lengthy review on newspaper pages “Moskovsky Telegraph” (“The Moscow Telegraph”), on the whole, negatively appreciated the results of work of a Russian poet. The fundamental error of the interpreter N.A. Polevoy regarded a tendency to represent Burns as “a simple peasant, which among other things flutes a poetic reed”. Thereby in the arrangement of I.I. Kozlov it emerged an emergence of an additional final stanza “not an ardent singer of Scotland burnt in the flame of passions, but a simple villager who very sweetly tells about his rural life”.34 And even Kozlov's designation that he created not a translation but a free imitation, by N.A. Polevoy's opinion, does not withdraw this serious call-down, because a Russian poet “bound himself to reproduce <...> Burns (sic),” but even in a small degree did not disclose the main – “a character
of the Burnsenian (sic) poetry”, whose recreation “should be demanded from imitation the same as that of the closest translation”.

In “Obozreniye russkoi slovesnosti za 1829 god” (“Review of Russian Literature of 1829”) printed in the almanac “Dennitca na 1830 god” (“The Day-Star of 1830”), I.V. Kireyevsky barely mentioned about the Kozlov’s book, noting as its meritoriousness a poignancy of the dedication to the late A. A. Voyeikova: “‘The Saturday Night’, an imitation of Burns, is remarkable by the verses devoted to the death of Voyeikova, applied at the beginning, where it is seen touching sense of soul that can love the beautiful”. “The Cotter’s Saturday Night in Scotland” by I. I. Kozlov was critically met by V.G. Belinsky, who noted in 1841 in his article “A Collection of Poems by Ivan Kozlov”, that it “is not a translation from Burns (sic), but a free imitation of this poet” and made such an emotional conclusion: “It is so pity, because this excellent play Kozlov could translate excellently, but as a free imitation – it is something strange”. V.G. Belinsky was wondering why “after lovely appeal of a Scottish poet to his motherland” a translator (in stanza XIX) suddenly appealed to Russia: “Assuming that his appeal is full of patriotic ardor; but whether it is appropriate – this is the question! <…> A Scotch life, as it is shown by Burns (sic) in his beautiful idyll, as much like the life of our muzhiks (men), peasant women, children, boys and girls, as a muse Calliplo to Kheraskov”.

In M.L. Mikhailov’s article “To a Field Daisy, which “despise some awkwardness of the verse almost rises to the immortal original,” was astonished by the fact that the poet was not attracted by a similar Burns’ poem “To a Field Mouse” (sic), and speculated about preconceptions of the translator: “We should like to know why Kozlov did not want to translate the other poem of Burns (sic) that is congruent with the previous one: “The nest of field mice devastated by a tiller”? May be, because of some modern timidity, he regarded the subject too low, may be this poem about field mice seemed for him a humiliation of poetry! It is surely a pity that with all his sympathy to art, a blind poet was not a stranger to some prejudices – the fame of an excellent translator didn’t seem for him an enviable fame, sometimes a true simplicity of thought seemed for him a nothingness.

Burns interested many translators who were active participants of the democratic movement of “shestid-esyatniki” (“the men of the sixties”). In particular, M.L. Mikhailov, who translated six poems, “John Anderson my jo,” “To a Mouse,” “To a Mountain Daisy,” “Lines on a merry Ploughman”, “John Barleycorn” and “Luckless Fortune”, was attracted by the works of Scottish poet that were saturated with social and acutely critical problematic, were full of belief in possibility of a life change. In M.L. Mikhailov’s article one more translation from Burns was published, a prosaic word for word translation of the poem “I’m fading awa, Jean…” that was not mentioned in the works on history of the Russian reception of Scottish poet’s creative work. Quoting in his critique of “Permskiy sbornik” (“The Perm Miscellanea”) a fragment of Russian folk song about hop “Kak vo slavnom bylo gorode Kazani…” (“It was happened in the glorious city of Kazan…”, M. L. Mikhailov correlated it with “John Barleycorn”: “True, there is no such harmony in it as in an ancient English song about a bogatyry (hero) John Barleycorn, which skillfully processed Robert Burns; but we think, judging by some features, that our song about hop came to us not in a body. A hop that stroke a muzhik’s head against a lath fence, revenges (as well as in the English song) for that it was buried in the ground, “thrust pokes into the heart”; and in a version recorded by Mr. Rogov, there is almost no relationship between the first humiliation and the following strength of the hop”.

To the circle of “the men of sixties” belonged P.I. Weinberg, a man of difficult but, at the same time, bright literary destiny, who chose for translation from Burns a cantata “Jolly Beggars”, a poem “Lord Gregory” and “John Anderson”. On the whole P.I. Weinberg adhered to the traditions of reception a Scottish poet established by the translations of M. L. Mikhailov, but in this case he could not reach their level, because in many ways he made the original rough, simplified it, he did not care about preserving the meter of the original verse, choosing the most successful lexical means, adequate transformation of the traditional images. In the Nos.9 and 10 of the magazine “Russkoye bogatstvo” (“The Russian Wealth”) of 1896, an essay by P.I. Weinberg “Robert Burns” was published where it was noted that the decline of English (and Scottish in particular) literature was outlined in the XVIII century; to overcome this decline “it was necessary a very large, truly poetic force” which emerged “due to establishing in the people the sense of freedom and nationality, obtained by a prolonged and bloody struggle”, and this force is – Robert Burns. In the period of the strongest love commotions Burns created “beautiful compositions with nature of the cosmic sadness”, such amazing and diverse things as “The Jolly Beggars,”
“The Cotter’s Saturday Night,” “The Vision,” “Daisy” (sic), “The Twa Dogs” and many others, to say nothing of little song, these wonderful gems of song poetry. Gradually, as P.I. Weinberg noted, it opened one more Burns’ gift, the satirical one; Burns joint the struggle against the local clergy, but not so much with “ruthlessly severe puritanical creed”, as with its practical application, allowed constant interference in private life, the promotion of espionage and intimidation.

A separate period of Russian comprehension of Burns’ creative work is connected with the activity of S. Ya. Marshak, who translated 215 literary works at the end of 1930 – the beginning 1960. In the following decades (until the early 1990s.), despite the demise of the translator and the emergence of a number of new translations, the Marshakian period lasted, marked by total domination of the reprints of S.Ya. Marshak. The critique traditionally noted that, deprived of literally closeness to the original, the S.Ya. Marshak’s translations were characterized by exceptional poetic fidelity. Yu. D. Levin saw a Russian translator’s departures from Burns in almost every line, but at the same time Levin emphasized Marshak’s ability to recreate faithfully, according to the laws of Russian speech, “the poetic whole, and not only its verbal content, but his style, imaging system, emotional mood, simplicity and dramatic character, poetry movement, musicality – in short, the features, due to which the translation takes the charm of the original work”.

Largely thanks to S.Ya. Marshak, Burns is repeatedly mentioned in the pages of the diary of A.T. Tvardovsky. The earliest informative mention related to August 19, 1959, was caused by the controversy with a complementary article by a poet A. Urban “Nationalism, skill, tradition. Notes on the work of A. Tvardovsky,” published in the magazine No.7 “Zvezda” (“The Star”) for 1959. Denying the influence of the experience of S. Ya. Marshak as a translator of Burns, accentuated by A. Urban, A.T. Tvardovsky described in his diary in detail the circumstances of his early acquaintance with the Scottish poet, due to anthology by N.V. Gerbel “English Poets in the Biographies and Samples” and translations by T.L. Shchepkina-Kupernik: “One critic, in general a complement maker, in the “Zvezda” indicates Marshak with his Burns as the forerunner of the verse of “Mouraviya” and other poems. The matter is not only in the fact that for the first time I met with Burns closer in 1936 thanks to translations by Shchepkina-Kupernik (the book was only just published then), if not to mention the Gerbelev’s Anthology, and that Marshak began to publish his translations of Burns in 1937-1938 (I even remember that I petitioned about publishing his Burns in the “Sovetskiy Pisatel” (“The Soviet Writer”) Publishing House), but I could say much more than that, oh well – then really there”. In March 1964 A.T. Tvardovsky read the book of Byron published in the series “Literaturniye pamyatniki” (“The Literary Monuments”), which went out of print not so long before that, and, what is more, on March 21 he made an excerpt from the book with Byron’s reasoning of what it would be if Burns was born noble; as a result of reading, on March 25 he made the following record: “<…> perhaps, in a sense, Burns proved to be more durable than Byron, though sagacity of the latter concerning ‘lowborn’ Burns does him honor”.

The death of S.Ya. Marshak, the first meeting of the Commission on his literary heritage, have evoked A.T. Tvardovsky’s conflicting feelings, – he not only failed to idealize the late poet, but noticed in his creative work and his style of communication a lot of unacceptable and internally alien things: “Marshak is no more, but marshakism remained, and it absolutely cannot be tolerated without Marshak. <…> I have long been hated that his manners to call the translations as “verse” (“I have written new verse” – but, look, another Burns and Shakespeare), his extortion every time, contrary to popular rule in our time, to indicate his name on top, not the bottom, and so on”. To the reflections about S. Ya. Marshak as a wonderful and unique Russian translator of Burns, A.T. Tvardovsky’s abidingly returned in his diary in the last years of his life, in particular, in connection with work on the article about Marshak’s creative work: for the first time this article was published in No. 2 of “Novy Mir” (“New World”) in 1968, and then, in 1970, the article was included as an epilogue in the fifth volume of the Collected Work of S. Ya. Marshak: “The top of the art translation of Marshak is his Russian Burns. Marshak would never find the way to him without experience of the poems for children. Burns is his love since youth, but he began to translate him with fervor, it seems to me, after publishing the book of translations of Burnsenian lyric poetry by Shchepkina-Kupernik (entry of August 21, 1967); he <Marshak> meets with his reader at the very early stage of his, the reader’s, spiritual life, tells him fairy tales, funny stories and so on. Then, as if speaking to the young man already, gives him lyrics of love and friendship (Burnes)” (entry of September 7, 1967); “R. Burns is the main love of all the life of Marshak” (entry of September 16, 1967); “The West’ in Marshak for children, and transition to
the ‘translations,’ and thence to Burns, the main love of Marshak” (entry of October 5, 1967)\textsuperscript{49}; “The article will consist of the three parts that now are being taken the outlines: Marshak for children, Marshak as a Burnsian poet, Marshak as a lyrical poet and Marshak as every kind” (entry of October 12, 1967)\textsuperscript{49}. Characterizing B. N. Polevoy, “a shallow person,” who after the suppression of the uprising in Czechoslovakia refused to communicate with the Czechoslovak counterparts, A.T. Tvardovsky recalled the story of S.Ya. Marshak, whom during the trip to Scotland B.N. Polevoy “urged <…> to act ‘offensively,’ exacerbating nat<ional> strife of Burns’ fellow countrymen with England” (entry of March 14, 1969)\textsuperscript{49}.

Working on the article “On the Poetry of Marshak”, A.T. Tvardovsky “incorporated” into it a significant fragment from his review of the book “Robert Burns in translations of S. Marshak”; the article was released in No. 4 of “Novy Mir” (“New World”) of 1951\textsuperscript{31}. The basic thesis of A.T. Tvardovsky was the affirmation that S. Ya. Marshak’s translations “possess such a charm of the Russian speech, as if Burns wrote in Russian himself, and so he appeared to our readers, without any mediation”\textsuperscript{52}. By the opinion of A. T. Tvardovsky, mastery of the translator is in the ability to convey “the originality of Burns’ poetry full of simplicity, clarity and noble grace”; “The translations by S. Ya. Marshak are made just in the verbal key that could be guessed by him only in the Pushkinian verse structure alien any excesses, strict and faithful to the laws of living speech, neglecting embellishment, but picturesque, accurate and expressive”\textsuperscript{52}. A.T. Tvardovsky especially noted the ability of S. Ya. Marshak to find in his translations “those intonational moves, which, without losing the original Russian nature, perfectly convey the music of the word, that has developed on the basis of language, by its very nature far from the Russian”\textsuperscript{52}. Burns became the Russian but remained the Scotsman: “Throughout the book you will not find even a single line that would sound as ‘a translation,’ as a certain construction of speech, – everything is in Russian, but this is a poetry of its specific structure and national coloring, and you can distinguish it from any other one”\textsuperscript{52}.

3. Discussion

Since the beginning of the 1990s it began a new, post-Soviet stage of developing of the heritage of the Scottish poet Robert Burns in Russia, when, along with the reissues of translations S.Ya. Marshak, new translations began to appear made by E. Feldman, Yu. Knyazev, G. Ussova, S. Sapozhnikov, S. Shorgin, I. Fradkin, M. Novikova and others. The collections of translations of Burns, composed by E. V. Vitkovsky, became notable events of those years. In particular, in the book of Burns “Collection of Poetry”\textsuperscript{56}, along with previously published translations of the previous years, there were included new translations of E. Feldman, S. Alexandrovsky, M. Boroditskaya, G. Zel’dovich, M. Freidkin, I. Bolychev, A. Petrova, V. Shirokov; and besides, many of these translations were made especially for this edition. The composition of the other book – “Verses and Poems”\textsuperscript{53} – differs significantly also by the selection of poet translators (D. Smirnov-Sadowsky, Yu. Lukacs, S. Alexandrovsky, N. Vinokurov, K. Manasenko, E. Kisterova, D. Manin, A. Petrov, G. Zel’dovich, M. Boroditskaya, E. Vitkovsky), and by selection of the works: for the first time in full in Russian submitted to early collection of Burns’ “Poems, Chiefly in the Scottish dialect,” released in Kilmarnock in 1786 in addition to which the texts of the translations of most famous works are placed. It should be noted that E. Vitkovsky made a few translations from Burns – “For a’ That and a’ That,” “Auld Lang Syne,” “Inscription on Ferguson’s Tombstone”\textsuperscript{54}.

Remarkable and justified is the E.V. Vitkovsky’s choice of the best examples of “Russian Burns” for the anthology “Seven Centuries of English Poetry,” which included “Jolly Beggars” and “John Barleycorn” translated by S.V. Petrov, “To a Haggis,” “Wha is that at my Bower Door?” translated by E.D. Feldman, “Halloween” translated by S.A. Alexandrovsky, “To a Louse, on seeing one on a Lady’s Bonnet at Church” translated by A. Petrova\textsuperscript{55}.

Separately should be named Evgeny Feldman, whose translations of Burns had a serious competition for translations by S.Ya. Marshak, and in many respects even surpassed them. In the third and fourth editions of the collection of scientific papers “Literary translation and comparative literary criticism” it was published a series of essays by Evgeny Feldman, “Burns, Marshak and others,” included 33 works, where each of them was a small story about a poem of Burns previously translated by S. Ya. Marshak, but due to certain circumstances needed a new reading\textsuperscript{54,57}. Among these circumstances are omission the significant portions (sometimes the entire stanzas) of the original text by the translator-predecessor, the interpretation of the basic idea of the original coming into collision with the original itself, omission some significant artistic details, violation of the principle of equilinearity (the
the fact that many of his translations have appeared in the period of intensive interest in Russia to the epoch of Burns, to the creativity of his contemporaries, to the literary debate about Burns and his works. Publication of talented translations by Sergey A. Alexandrovsky from Samuel Thomson (1766-1816) (“Epistle to Mr. R****T B***S”), Thomas Cunningham (1776-1834) (“Verses on the Death of Burns”), Richard Gall (1776-1801) (“Epistle Addressed to Robert Burns,” “On the Death of Burns. Addressed to a Friend,” “Written on Visiting the House in which the Celebrated Robert Burns was Born, and the Surrounding Scenery, in Autumn 1799”), Thomas Campbell (1777-1844) (“Ode to the Memory of Burns (1815”), Hew Ainslie (1792-1878) (“Farewell to the Land of Burns,” “Lines Written on the Anniversary of Burns’ Birth-Day”) allowed the reader to comprehend the heritage of Burns within the context of the history of Scottish literature, to see the background that masterfully fetched out the great poet, made understanding of his artistic identity clearer.

To the few interesting publications that give an idea not only of Burns, but also about the other English poets of the time, thus allowing to aware more of individual phenomena of the literary process, to comprehend Burns in a broad historical and cultural context, also relates an already mentioned three-volume anthology “Seven Centuries of English Poetry.” Finally, it contributes to a better understanding of Burns the circumstance that E. Feldman has translated 394 of Burns’ works (11,706 lines of poetry), while S. Ya. Marshak – for comparison – only 215 works (6,102 lines of poetry).

For many years, since 1968, Evgeny Feldman published his translations in magazines, in author’s and collective collections, and finally, in separate books. At the moment, most completely Burns in translations of Evgeny Feldman is presented in the volume of Moscow publishing house “Mir knigi” (“The World of Book”), printed in 2007, – from the total volume of the book including 8,293 lines of poetry (11.85 signatures), Evgeny Feldman has translated 6,272 lines of poetry (9.96 signatures). But it is much less in comparison with a new book, that is being prepared by the publishing house “Vita Nova” (St. Petersburg) which will include 355 Burns’ poems translated by E. Feldman, with total amount of 9,839 lines of poetry (14.06 signatures); a part of the translations was made especially for this book, and will be published for the first time. As we see, this collection of poems will give the impression that is close to a complete one, about
Feldman’s Burns, about Feldman’s particular manner as a translator of Burns; at the same time, it will give possibility to the reader – in view of the vastness of the represented poetic sample – to form a holistic impression of the work of the Scottish author.

Undoubtedly, the appearance of the book of translations by E. Feldman will become a significant event in the history of the Russian reception of Robert Burns’ poetry. But, summing up the search for the previous years and bringing together the results of hard work, this book also emphasizes by its appearance the great prospects. One can argue long whether the Russian reader (especially the mass reader) needs full Burns, one can doubt for a long time of the need for the translation of those or other works, but one thing is clear: the more fully Burns is represented in Russian, the more convex his creative personality is opened and the personality of the author himself appears more clearly before us. In this regard it is significant the appearance of “The Collection of Poems” by Burns in the translations by S. Sapozhnikov, issued by St. Petersburg Polytechnic University in 2014 and included 783 works with total amount of 19,672 lines of poetry. Many works translated by S. Sapozhnikov are only attributed to R. Burns that, with rare exceptions, does not specified by the translator. Being made by a talented man, the translations by S. Sapozhnikov bear the imprint of hastiness, manifested also in a frequent unfortunate choice of Russian equivalents of the English lexemes, and stylistic lack of uniformity, and many other obvious irregularities that need to be eliminated. However, the merit of S. Sapozhnikov became drawing contours of the complete Russian Burns, which, in principle, would hardly have been possible without the experience that has been accumulated in previous years, without the achievements that are the result of work of many predecessors, primarily – of S.Ya. Marshak and E. Feldman, who have devoted to Russian Burns more than one decade of their lives.

4. Conclusions

Russian Burns resembles an infinite universe: at first it seems that all written about him is so much, that it is hardly possible to add something to what has been said, but once you look more closely, it opens to your eye a lot of non-understandable, incomprehensible that needs new translation readings and research interpretations. Literary scholarship publications today are mainly devoted to “Russian Burnsiana” of pre-revolutionary and Soviet times, impartial holistic comprehension of the post-Soviet stage in Russian reception of Robert Burns will become possible, obviously after some time. But already now we can confidently say about Evgeny Feldman as a leading domestic translator of Burns of the late XX – early XXI century – not only and not so much according to the number of translated works, but according to the depth of penetration into Burns’ intentions. Translations by E.D. Feldman, on the one hand, have continued the tradition of the predecessors, and on the other, have marked a new stage in Russian Burnsiana.
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