

A Russian Symbolist Novel in Translation: A Case Study of Andrey Bely's *Серебряный голубь*¹

Angelika Reichmann

Probably there is no need to introduce Andrey Bely (1880-1934) to any reader even superficially acquainted with 20th century Russian prose and poetry: He was an outstanding Symbolist poet, a major theoretician of the movement, a forerunner of Russian Formalists in his critical writings – and most importantly, he is remembered as an innovator of the novel form whose significance in Russian Literature is comparable only to that of James Joyce in English Modernism. While his major novel, *Petersburg* (*Петербург*, 1913) is subject to universal praise, his first experiment with the novel form, *The Silver Dove* (*Серебряный голубь*, 1909) does not seem to have such an undisputed place in the Bely canon. Though it is arguably the first Russian Symbolist novel, and therefore its importance should not be underestimated either in the context of Bely's oeuvre or in the history of Russian Symbolism, its critical assessment – for various reasons – has been rather uneven both in Russia and abroad. As far as Russia is concerned, it is a direct consequence of the political implications of the novel: a story, which follows the “immersion” of a Russian intellectual, a Symbolist poet, in the life of sectarian Russian peasants allied with communists and ends in his ritual murder by the same people, obviously could not even be published in the Soviet Era – let alone discussed in detail objectively.

Since the collapse of the communist regime, however, the novel has seen several editions and has been subject to much criticism. Testifying to the actuality of the novel, Aleksandr Etkind, a leading figure of Russian Postmodernist thought, has even claimed that “it is easier to comprehend the duality of the text [of *Серебряный голубь*] relying on the critical experience related to the ideas of deconstruction than on the models of Realism and Symbolism” (Эткинд 400)². It goes without saying, that the above-mentioned political reason must have been an important factor in the rather general neglect

¹ Research for the present article was carried out with the assistance of the Eötvös Scholarship supplemented by a grant from the Hungarian Ministry of Education (OM). It was originally formulated as a presentation on the conference “A fordítás arcai – Fordítástudományi kutatások az Eszterházy Károly Főiskola Bölcsészettudományi Karán” (8th November 2007). Let me express my special thanks to Albert Péter Vermes, who encouraged me to write this paper and helped me with his invaluable advice both in the research procedure and in the final formation of my ideas.

² All translations from non-English sources are mine – A. R.

the novel has suffered in Hungarian literary criticism. Since its first and only Hungarian translation by István Peterdi (1888-1944), published in 1926 with the title *Az ezüst galamb*, the novel has been largely forgotten: it did not receive any critical response, and has not been retranslated. In current histories of Hungarian literature Bely's name, let alone his first novel, is not mentioned as a shaping influence on any Hungarian author³. In contrast, in the West the novel was published in reprint editions of the original Russian version and has been translated into many languages, among them English; once in 1974 (Elsworth, "Note" 26) and more recently in 2000 by John Elsworth.

The present study aims at discovering the translational factors behind the dissimilarities of the novel's fate in the two target literatures by comparing the Hungarian and English versions of *Серебряный голубь* mentioned above. The two texts present absolutely different solutions for the extremely complicated task the translation of *Серебряный голубь* – a narrative written in often rhythmic ornamental prose on a populist theme and told by an ever-changing, most versatile narrative voice based on Gogolian skaz – poses. Apart from the source text there is no feature the two versions seem to share – and even that appears to be doubtful sometimes. After a brief introduction of the dominant stylistic features of the original text the analysis focuses on the factors that might have made the translators opt for such utterly different approaches, namely, it explores the role of the literary system and translational norms of the target literature and of the translators' personal qualities. It goes on to highlight the qualitative differences between the two translations through the analysis of a short excerpt from the novel in its Hungarian and English versions. On the one hand, the translations prove to be inevitable products of their literary and cultural environment, and on the other it becomes clear why Bely's novel in one case has not particularly influenced that very environment, while in the other it has its modest but indisputably allotted place in it. Peterdi's translation, which is unable to present Bely's novel as a work of outstanding artistic quality, is probably a major cause of its failure to enter Hungarian literary and critical consciousness. The very existence of Elsworth's more successful translation is evidence to the contrary in the case of English literature, let alone the fact that Bely's novel now, almost a hundred years after its first publication, is still present on the English-American book market – even if it is targeted at a very particular readership.

Серебряный голубь: Unique Style Parade in Rhythmic Ornamental Prose

Since the first step of translation is an analysis of the source text (Popovič 57-58), it is worth giving an overview of the fundamental stylistic features of *Серебряный голубь*. The first and most conspicuous quality of the novel is the

³ Cf. Szabolcsi Miklós, (ed.), *A magyar irodalom története*, Vol. 6 (Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1966) and Szegedy-Maszák Mihály and Veres András, (eds.), *A magyar irodalom története*, Vol. III (Budapest, Gondolat Kiadó, 2007).

stylistic variety it presents: telling a story of the people and the intelligentsia through various forms of skaz supplies an opportunity for the use of numerous registers within the Russian language both in the characters' and the narrators' speech. Primarily in narration the delicate shifts between these sociolects are hardly ever explicitly marked (Elsworth, "Introduction" 21). The tone of the different narrative voices and their stylistic reminiscences, however, are central features of the poetics of the novel and therefore cannot be ignored in its interpretation and must not be neutralised in its translation. For this reason the translator's ability to keep the different stylistic layers separate in the novel is a marker of successful translation. The second central characteristic stylistic feature of the novel is the use of – often rhythmic – ornamental prose, which locates the entire text on the borderline between prose and verse, and therefore leads to the emergence of translational problems fundamentally characteristic for the translation of poetry rather than fiction.

The variety of the characters' speech represents a translational problem which is related to the use of both regional and social dialects. John Elsworth rightly claims that though their speech "does not contain any consistent regional character", Bely's peasants obviously cannot and do not speak the Russian literary language, their conversations "contain much regional and substandard usage" ("Note" 28). Thus folklore images and proverbs, grammatically incorrect collocations, folk etymologies, dialectical phrases, "misheard" foreign words and verbatim representations of spoken forms defying the norms of pronunciation for standard Russian are equally characteristic features of their style. In addition, the novel represents a cross-section of rural society, including peasants, the local priest and teacher, small-town clerks, communist agitators, wealthy merchants, aristocrats, and the representative of Russian intelligentsia – the classical philologist cum Symbolist poet protagonist. The speech of aristocratic characters with its (over)sophistication and markedly foreign flavour poses just as effective a counterpoint to peasant talk as the collection of Symbolist clichés suffusing the poet's elocutions.

In comparison with the manifold but relatively obvious stylistic variety outlined above, narration represents a much more complex problem area. It is probably the most debated aspect of the poetics of *Серебряный голубь*, as no consensus has yet been reached even about the number of the narrators/narrative voices. Lavrov's most sophisticated analysis of this issue might serve as a point of reference for outlining the translational difficulties it causes. Following the traditions of Bely criticism, he also traces the origins of the narrative technique applied in the novel to Gogolian skaz – a way of story-telling which implies the use of a "narratorial mask", a fictitious narrator distanced from the author, who often has only limited narrative competence and is therefore unreliable, who is often markedly below the implied author in social rank and intelligence, and who has a distinct style evoking oral story-telling and folk tradition (cf. Karancsy 131-132). Lavrov distinguishes three such "narratorial masks" in *Серебряный голубь*, which represent the voice of the communities associated with the three locations of the action: a village, a small town and an aristocratic

mansion. However, he also adds a fourth, impersonal narrative voice to the list, which is closest to the “authorial” voice and which is diffused in the entire text of the novel. Its appearance is most obvious in the numerous lyrical-pathetic mythic digressions (Лавров 278-285). Consequently, the narrative voices can be placed along a scale of four levels: in their hierarchy the stylisation of popular-anecdotic story-telling occupies the lowest position, whereas the euphonic, sometimes even rhythmic language of Symbolist prose and poetry with its unbelievably dense imagery takes the highest. The two other layers by and large fall within the boundaries of Russian literary language.

These registers are dramatically different in their tone and consequently in their effect on the reader. In *skaz* the narrator’s limited narrative competence and intelligence give rise to a marked distance⁴ between his voice and the implied author’s position – in other words, its use is a source of irony. This distance, however, is not the same in the four narrators’ case in *Серебряный голубь*: while the village story-teller unconsciously becomes an object of the reader’s irony because of his limited understanding of the events he is trying to tell and interpret, the small-town chronicler clearly satirises stale rural life and consciously uses irony to voice his criticism. As opposed to these, the impersonal narrator’s lyrical digressions are dominated by a pathetic tone. While irony implies the reader’s critical distance from the narrator’s opinions, pathos, on the contrary, calls for empathy and an acceptance of the narrator’s interpretation of the events. A similar effect is reached when the same impersonal narrative voice becomes inseparable from a character’s voice in free indirect speech, thereby creating a text which is often subject to interpretation rather in terms of the stream-of-consciousness novel than in terms of classical prose writing (cf. Karancsy 131-138).

The narrative voices are different not only with respect to their register, tone and effect, but also concerning their allusiveness: each of them consciously and distinctly evokes one particular Russian writer. As Lavrov points out, the three narrators of *skaz* create texts clearly reminiscent of Gogol, Dostoevsky and Leskov, respectively (Лавров 278-285). The impersonal narrator’s style, however, draws heavily on Bely’s own poetry and essays, including their motifs and tropes as well as their ideas⁵. Therefore in *Серебряный голубь* the very

⁴ Cf. the varying of “epic distance” in Bely’s novels in Szilárd Léna, *Andrej Belij és az orosz szímbolista regény poétikája* (Budapest, Széphalom Könyvműhely, 2001), 80-81.

⁵ The analysis of intertextual relationships between Bely’s poetic, essayistic and prosaic texts is a popular research area. Cf. the parallels of Bely’s early poetry and *Серебряный голубь* in Каталин Сёке, “Усадьба Гуголево – Символистская трактовка дворянской культуры в романе Андрея Белого *Серебряный голубь*,” *Научные издания Московского Венгерского Колледжа I* (2001), 200. The treatment of Bely’s essay “Луг зелёный” as an intertext of *Серебряный голубь* is a commonplace in Bely criticism, e.g. М. Козьменко, “Автор и герой повести *Серебряный голубь*,” Андрей Белый, *Серебряный голубь* (Москва, Художественная литература, 1989), 12-15. A similar relationship between the novel and the essay “Священные цвета” is just as well supported, cf. Ангелика Рейхманн, “Профанированные ‘Священные цвета’ – *Серебряный голубь* Андрея Белого,” *Slavica XXVIII* (1997), 117-133.

style of the different narrative voices represents a device which is most often lost in translation – that of allusion, an intracultural reminiscence (Popovič 27).

In addition to these features, *Серебряный голубь* is also obviously written in ornamental prose⁶. Ornamental prose, as a typically Modernist form of fiction, calls readers' attention to its own textual nature: pushing the elements of plot into the background, it is structured around leitmotifs, which are highlighted and connected with poetic devices rather unusual in prose, so as to achieve “the widest possible range of polysemy” (Szilárd, „Орнаментальность/Орнаментализм” 70-71). As László Karacsony points out, the “lyrical-emotional-metaphorical” structure of ornamental prose is strikingly similar to the montage-like text of stream-of-consciousness novels based on free association – in fact, there is a fairly easy transition from one technique to the other (Karacsony 132-134). In ornamental prose the musical aspects of the text (repetitions and variations) play an extremely important role in connecting images and tropes and highlighting their various semantic aspects. This insistence on musicality, in its turn, often results in rhythmic prose sections. From a translational perspective, therefore, the ornamental and often rhythmic prose of *Серебряный голубь* is at the crossroads of prose and poetry. Consequently, in addition to the problem areas outlined above it also raises another set of translational dilemmas which are normally more typical for the translation of poems than prose texts.

Tradition, the “Place” of Translated Texts and the Translator’s Personality

Before analysing Peterdi’s and Elsworth’s translated texts, let me mention some features which are related simply to their age, and therefore are not examined in detail. Then I will proceed to focus on three fundamental shaping factors of the translators’ individual approaches: the literary and translational traditions of the target cultures and the translators’ personal features. A closer study of these three fields proves that the two translators’ choice of diametrically opposed strategies was in fact an inevitable necessity and also foreshadows the dominant features of the Hungarian and English versions – texts unavoidably “written into” the literary and translational traditions of the target cultures and into the personal discourse of the individual translators.

Peterdi’s 1926 version, for several objective reasons, seems to prove the rule that translated texts lose their actuality much more quickly than the original works (Popovič 165), while Elsworth’s text, published in 2000, is obviously in a much more advantageous position from this respect. Firstly, Peterdi could not even use a reliable Russian-Hungarian dictionary, let alone a dictionary of Russian dialects. Relying on his own resources, he made up segments where he did not understand the original text – there is no point even in asking the question how (in)adequate his translation is in the literal sense of the word. Secondly, at the turn of the century the norms of transcribing and/or translating

⁶ Cf. “Andrey Bely’s prose, [...] is the offspring of his poetry and [...] begins with the ‘pure’ ornamentality of *Серебряный голубь*” (Karacsony 131).

Russian names (forenames, patronymics and surnames) were not yet set, and for today's readers Peterdi's inconsistent practice – a mixture of transcription and (mis)translation – looks especially outdated and disturbing. Thirdly, for historical reasons the number of Russian loan words in Hungarian has dramatically increased since the end of WWII, consequently, some of Peterdi's translations and circumlocutions for Russian terms seem to be examples of unnecessary garrulousness today. In addition, they deprive the text from a part of its "couleur locale", since the Hungarian explanations-translations do not evoke the same atmosphere as the words of recognisably Russian origin would. Elsworth's translation, on the contrary, has all the advantages of "freshness" and contemporariness. These differences, however, result rather from the time which has elapsed since the publication of Peterdi's work, than from the two translators' different readings and translating strategies.

There are three factors, however, which must have played a crucial role in shaping the latter. First of all, the literary systems of the two target cultures were in fundamentally different situations at the moment *Серебряный голубь* was translated. According to Itamar Even-Zohar, translated literature can take either a "central" or a "peripheral position" in the literary "polysystem" of the target literature, depending on the actual situation of the latter. This relative position has a definitive impact not only on the selection of works to be translated, but also on the translator's basic strategy and the potential fate of the translated text. Translated literature can "maintain a central position" in "young" or "peripheral" literatures, or in any literature "in a literary vacuum". In such cases highly innovative works are chosen for translation, in fact, translated literature becomes the scene for introducing new techniques and models in the target literature. Translation, therefore, is more "adequate" in these instances; it often strives to convey the formal innovations of the source text even by breaking the conventions of the target literature. These innovations, in their turn, can either become organic parts of the target literature, or can prove to be indigestibly iconoclastic and revolutionary for it and be consequently rejected. In literatures maintaining a central position, on the contrary, translated literature is pushed to the periphery. It often becomes "a major factor of conservatism", since it applies rather outdated models and for this reason it does not fundamentally shape the target literature – it even loses touch with it occasionally. "Adequacy" and "equivalence" are of secondary importance for the translator, who relies on already existing models in the target literature for creating his or her text (Even-Zohar 200-203).

The situation of the Hungarian "literary polysystem" in the 1920s predestined Peterdi's translation to be an "adequate" rendering of Bely's technical innovations in *Серебряный голубь* – even at the cost of breaking the rules of the Hungarian literary language, or Hungarian language, for that matter. Hungarian literature, being the literature of a small nation, is par excellence "peripheral" (Even-Zohar 201). In addition, in the 1920s it suffered a minor crisis after the heyday of the "first generation of the *Nyugat*" – a group of Symbolist and Post-Symbolist writers, mostly poets, associated with the

groundbreaking literary journal *Nyugat*, launched in 1908 – mostly palpable in fiction⁷. The contemporaries, for example Antal Szerb, himself a writer at the beginning of his career in the 1920s, experienced the decade as a period devoid of innovation and new ideas (Szerb 497). Consequently, the claim that translated literature has always been a major source of inspiration and innovation in Hungarian literature seems to be especially true for this decade: in the chronology of a recently published history of Hungarian literature the year 1923 is actually marked by the publication of a translated volume, Baudelaire's *Les Fleurs du mal* (Józan 54). A series of publications related to Russian literature and associated with the prestigious circle of the *Nyugat* around 1926 testify to the fact that this heightened interest in translated literature included Russian authors, as well⁸. Bely's text relying on Symbolist aesthetics could have been an innovative force in Hungarian literature not only because of its "peripheral" position and the minor "crisis" it was going through at the time, but also because of the unique nature of the Symbolist novel. Though Symbolism was a flourishing trend in Hungarian poetry after the turn of the century – in fact, it was only the near past for Peterdi – unlike Russian Symbolism, it did not produce novels wholly shaped along Symbolist principles⁹. The production of such works is actually a specific feature of Russian Symbolism (Szilárd, "A szimbolizmus és a vele határos jelenségek" 198) and its parallels can only be found in English and French stream-of-consciousness novels. All of these factors might have urged Peterdi to convey the formal experimentations of *Серебряный голубь* as "literally" as possible.

Elsworth's situation from this respect was exactly the opposite in 2000. He translated *Серебряный голубь* into the language of a "central" literature and its "innovative power" was simply out of the question in the Postmodernist era: on the one hand, the groundbreaking formal innovations of the Russian Symbolist novel appeared as authentic developments in the English Modernist tradition, and on the other hand, Postmodernist fiction with its obviously heavy reliance on Modernist literature has also tried to get "beyond" its models and devices. Thus, though there was no "Symbolist movement proper" in English Literature

⁷ Cf. the works in the focus of attention for the decade between 1920 and 1930 in the recent history of Hungarian literature edited by Mihály Szegedy-Maszák and András Veres: Kassák, as the representative of Hungarian Avante-gard poetry and probably the most important innovator at that time, features in two articles written about this period (Szegedy-Maszák—Veres 25-36; 113-124), while there is only one novel, Kosztolányi's *Pacsirta*, which deserves the editors' attention in the first decade after WWI (Szegedy-Maszák—Veres 96-107).

⁸ Cf. Laziczius Gyula, "Bonkáló Sándor könyve – Az orosz irodalomról," *Nyugat* 14 (1926) – a review on Bonkáló's recently published and rather overdue history of Russian literature; Bonkáló Sándor, "Orosz elbeszélők," *Nyugat* 26 (1926) – a review on a recently published six-volume series of Russian short fiction, including Leskov, a master of skaz and ornamental prose; Piln'ák "Ezer év," *Nyugat* 16 (1926) – a short story by Piln'ák, another author associated with ornamental prose; Bonkáló Sándor, "Az orosz forradalom írói," *Nyugat* 16 (1926) – an appreciation of contemporary Russian writers, among them Piln'ák.

⁹ Cf. "In Hungarian short fiction at the turn of the century there was not formed such a great variety of Symbolist prose genres as in France or Russia" (Dobos 127).

(Bradbury and McFarlane 31), the Joycean and especially the Woolfian novel is clearly shaped along “broadly Symbolist aesthetics” (Bradbury and McFarlane 29). Post-war English writers, like Lawrence Durrell, Doris Lessing or John Fowles, for that matter, carry on the same tradition, while they also rewrite it from a Postmodernist viewpoint and discredit the metaphysically interpreted Symbol – call it epiphany or a “moment of being” – at the core of Symbolist aesthetics. As a result, the relatively “peripheral” position held by translations of Russian Symbolist literature in the English “literary polysystem” must have urged Elsworth to comply with the existing norms and conventions of English literature, and therefore formulate a “less adequate” translation of Bely’s novel.

Secondly, the two translators could rely on fundamentally different translational traditions. Gideon Toury convincingly demonstrates in his study that translation is a “norm-governed activity” – a process regulated by a number of rules constituting the actual system of translational norms and the translational tradition of a given literature – in several respects. Among them, two seem to be highly relevant in the case of *Серебряный голубь*. At the very start, the prioritisation of the norms of the source language/literature or the target language/literature is governed by the so-called “initial norm”: if the translator opts for the former, the result is a more “adequate” translation, whereas in the latter case more shifts are introduced into the translated text in comparison with the source text (Toury 207-208). Consequently, this decision directly influences the choices made later, during the very process of translation, which are regulated by so-called “operational norms” (Toury 207-209). Concerning these choices, Peterdi’s situation was rather paradoxical: the contemporary Hungarian translational tradition advocated two contradictory principles as far as the initial norm and the operational norms are concerned: it required both adequacy and the creation of a literary work of art in its own right in translation. As Ildikó Józán states in a recent article, in the 1910s and 1920s “a change of paradigms” took place with relation to translation in Hungarian literature, a procedure which practically ended by 1923 and whose results have dominated our notions of the place and norms of translation in Hungarian culture ever since. “Adequacy of form and content” became the fundamental criteria of translation (Józán 52-53), with the simultaneous requirement of obvious “literariness”, the creation of an artefact on a level with authentic creative texts (Józán 66). This “change of paradigms” was carried out in theory and equally importantly in practice by the first generation of *Nyugat* (Józán 53) – the very journal Peterdi himself, as a minor poet, was also associated with (“Peterdi István”). He was immersed in a translational tradition which had just been formulated on the basis of translational practice predominantly concerned with poetry, what is more, with poetry preceding the innovations and “textual play” of Avant-garde/Modernist works (Józán 61). It held that everything written in verse could be translated into Hungarian as such and thus unallegedly prioritised form and the translation of poetry as an “art” in comparison with the “lay” translation of fiction (Somlyó 102-146). It also included a “preference for emotional and musical elements even at the cost of inadequacy in content” (Tellér 205). Thus, the current

translational practice also urged Peterdi to produce an adequate translation, which would probably highlight the formal innovations and poetic quality of the original text – the only question was whether it would be a work of art in Hungarian, as well. Elsworth, on the contrary, faced much lower expectations. The French-English translational tradition does not make the adequate translation of formal features a norm, moreover, even the prose translation of poetry has its own distinct tradition (Somlyó 140). Strengthening the effect of the fact that English literature maintains a “central” position, this translational tradition legitimises a “less adequate” translation, in which the norms of the target language and literature are prioritised.

And last but not least, the translators’ personal traits and individual readings might have had rather dissimilar effects on their strategies – especially if one takes into consideration the fact that translated texts “are often written into the translators’ own discourse” (Somlyó 135). Peterdi was not simply an acknowledged translator of classical Russian prose, who became acquainted with the language and the culture while he was a prisoner of war for seven years in Russia (“Peterdi István”), but also a poet – a writer of mostly laconic love poems in free verse¹⁰. His poetic language is rather close to prose and often devoid of tropes, and he usually relies for effect on the power of controlled emotions, as his few poems sporadically published in *Nyugat* clearly demonstrate¹¹. Equally scarcely, he also brought out reviews and essays, whose prose text is characterised by long, sometimes boundless sentences, which are often divided into smaller units by semicolons – occasionally rather to confuse than help readers¹². His familiarity with the Russian classical tradition and his poetic ambitions foreshadow a reading of Bely’s text which is equally sensitive to its allusive nature and its poetic qualities. The reading, however, which Peterdi outlines in his introduction for the Hungarian translation, only partly justifies these expectations. While he fails to notice how much *Серебряный голубь* is rooted in the Russian classical tradition, he, like a true poet and translator of *Nyugat*, focuses on the “lyrical” qualities of the novel and – probably under the impact of the just emerging trend of “new populism” in Hungarian literature (Szerb 497) – highlights its concern with the people and the folk tradition (Peterdi v-vi). This reading suggests a translational strategy which would be mostly concerned with conveying these particular formal and stylistic qualities of the source text to Hungarian readers.

As opposed to Peterdi, the poet-translator, Elsworth is just another translator in the long line of philologists trying their hand at literature, so common in the French-English tradition (Somlyó 140). As a researcher, he specialises in Russian literature and has devoted decades to studying Bely’s art –

¹⁰ Cf. Komlós Aladár, “A hallgatag költő,” *Nyugat* 11 (1926).

¹¹ To mention only a few examples, cf. the poems published at about the time he translated Bely’s novel: “Találkozás,” *Nyugat* 15-16 (1923); “Rövid ima,” *Nyugat* 3 (1924); “Panasz,” *Nyugat* 8 (1926); “Tanítás,” *Nyugat* 1 (1927).

¹² Cf. “Bevezetés,” Andrej Belij, *Az ezüst galamb*, trans. Peterdi István (Budapest, Genius, 1926), v-viii; “Füst Milánról,” *Nyugat* 3 (1934).

producing, among others, a distinguished monograph on the Russian author¹³. His interpretation of the novel, outlined in his professional introduction to the volume, is the accumulation of several years of related research. Consequently, apart from the two features emphasised by Peterdi, he also identifies the allusiveness, ornamentality and stylistic variety of the source text with professional accuracy (“Introduction” 20-21). Just like Peterdi, he also recognises the significance of the acoustic elements in the text, but immediately gives up any hope of rendering them – with the exception of some occasional coincidences – in English (“A Note” 27-28). And just like Peterdi, he recognises the stylistic consequences of Bely’s thematic concern, but following current translational norms (cf. Popovič 186), he does not intend to convey the diverse Russian dialects and sociolects of the source text through the use of British, or even American regional versions of English. While Elsworth’s interpretation foreshadows a more “balanced” translation, which does not prioritise one or two features of the source text, it also promises a kind of “prose translation” of Bely’s highly poetical ornamental prose.

In conclusion, a study of the two different literary and translational traditions and a glimpse at the two translators’ personal qualities clearly outline their potential motives behind choosing diametrically opposed strategies. On the one hand, Peterdi was probably encouraged to produce a more “adequate” – that is, formally adequate, therefore iconoclastic, innovative and unconventional – text by all three factors. He was equally expected to produce literature proper, however. The major question is whether his individual talent is sufficient to “reproduce” the highly poetic work of a first rate prose-writer on the same artistic level? Elsworth, on the other hand, was not forced into the position of a literary innovator by any of the three factors mentioned above. Even if he had been, the century which has passed since Bely wrote *Серебряный голубь* and which has established his position among the most outstanding European Modernist writers, would have suggested that he should think twice before he pretends to that role. Readers can expect him to opt for a less ambitious solution and produce a text which is adequate in content but follows the patterns of the target language and literature rather than those of the source.

The Source Text and its Translations

Let me demonstrate the consequences of these two diametrically opposed approaches to the Russian Symbolist text with a comparative analysis of roughly the first paragraph of the novel in the source text and in the Hungarian and Russian versions.

Ещё, и ещё в синюю бездну дня, полную жарких, жестоких блесков, кинула зычные клики целебевкая колокольня. Туда и сюда заёрзали в

¹³ Cf. J. D. Elsworth, *Andrey Bely: A Critical Study of the Novels* (Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 1983).

воздухе над нею стрижи. А душный от благовонья Троицын день обсыпал кусты лёгкими, розовыми шиповниками. И жар душил грудь; в жаре стекленили стрекозиные крылья над прудом, взлетали в жар в синюю бездну дня, – туда, в голубой покой пустынь. Потным рукавом усердно размазывал на лице пыль распаренный сельчанин, тащась на колокольню раскатать медный язык колокола, пропотеть и поусердствовать во славу Божью. И ещё, и ещё клинькала в синюю бездну дня целебеевская колокольня; и юлили над ней, и писали, повизгивая, восьмёрки стрижи. Славное село Целебеево, подгородное; средь холмов оно да лугов [...]. (Белый, *Серебряный голубь* 158-159)

In a “literal” translation the excerpt reads as follows:

Again and again, into the blue abyss of the day, full of hot and cruel brilliance, the Tselebeyevo bell-tower cast its brazen cries. The martins fretted about in the air above it. And stifling, scent-laden Whit Sunday had sprinkled the bushes with light pink briar-roses. The heat lay heavy on the chest; in the heat dragonfly wings glazed above the pond, soared into the heat of the day’s blue abyss – there, into the light blue serenity of the void. With his sweat-soaked sleeve, a perspiring villager zealously smeared dust over his face, as he dragged himself along to the bell-tower to swing the bell’s bronze clapper and sweat and toil to the glory of God. And again and again the Tselebeyevo bell-tower tinkled into the blue abyss of the day; and above it the martins darted and traced, with shrill cries, figures of eight. It’s a fine village, Tselebeyevo, not far from the town, among hills and meadows [...].

As far as the stylistic variety of *Серебряный голубь* is concerned, on the one hand, this excerpt proves to be formulated by the impersonal narrative voice evoking Bely’s style in his lyrical and essayistic texts, and on the other it is an example for the delicate transition between the different “narratorial masks” and styles in the novel. Firstly, this highly ornamental section with its often rhythmic segments is reminiscent of the style of Symbolist poetry in general, more concretely of Bely’s own lyrical essay, “Луг зелёный” (Белый, *Символизм как миропонимание* 328-334). The densely metaphorical style with its pathetic tone, the musicality of the text, and the imagery of the “blue abyss” of the sky with the martins diving into it all point to this intertext. Accordingly, there is practically no dialectical phrase or expression in the excerpt which would evoke the folk tradition. However, there is a new coinage in it, the verb “клинькать”, which is a typical example of Bely’s fascination with both onomatopoeic words and musicality. Secondly, there is a sentence in the middle of the paragraph which already foreshadows the anecdotic story-telling of the village narrator clearly appearing at the beginning of the second paragraph. The sentence describing the perspiring villager breaks both the row of sophisticated images and the pathetic tone associated with the narrator’s style: while the vulgar sweating of the peasant has nothing to do with the metaphysical depth of the “blue abyss”, the use of a phrase from a religious context, “sweat and toil to the glory of God”,

clearly introduces ironic distance here. The naïve, literal reading of the religious cliché paves the way for the introduction of a narrator with obviously limited narrative competence – a narrator, who clearly appears in the first line of the following paragraph and who thinks the world of himself and the dusty little village of Tselebeyevo in the middle of nowhere.

In addition, the excerpt obviously shows the most important characteristic features of ornamental prose: it is structured around leitmotifs, which emerge from the combination of dense imagery and musical effects to highlight tropes. Which are the most important leitmotifs of this section? Practically all the images it contains, from the “blue abyss” through the martins and the bell-tower to the untranslatable reference to the Holy Trinity in the name of the holiday and the imagery of writing and reading. This, of course, becomes clear only in the context of the entire novel, where leitmotifs function through recurrent images, which acquire an increasing number of figurative meanings as they keep reappearing in different textual environments, finally to be revealed as symbols with a potentially infinite number of meanings. Hence the great number of tropes in this segment, as well: there are metaphors (“стекленели стрекозиные крылья”), personifications (“кинула зычные клики”, “Троицын день обсыпал”), even a synaesthesia (“голубой покой пустынь”) in it.

These images, in their turn, are accompanied by a number of acoustic effects¹⁴ which have a dual function. They both create a text which defies the norms of prose writing, consequently slowing down the reading procedure and drawing readers’ attention to the text and its motifs rather than encouraging “reading for the plot”, and lead the reader away from the content of the words and toward their melody and euphony. In the excerpt quoted above there are several rhythmic elements which slow down reading and call attention to the leitmotifs. Bely uses a great number of inversions, brings the subject into focus by placing it surprisingly at the end of the sentence and formulates long and complicated sentences divided into smaller units by emphatic caesuras indicated by semicolons¹⁵. At the same time, the text is incredibly melodious: there are several alliterations (“жарких, жестоких”, “кинула зычные клики целебеевская колокольня”), rhyming endings (“лёгкими, розовыми шиповниками”) and a poem-like repetitive rhythm resulting from the often strictly parallel structure of clauses in the passage. Therefore, the caesura and sudden change of rhythm in the structural and emotional centre of the paragraph, before the expression “туда, в голубой покой пустынь”, is even more effective in giving special emphasis to the phrase. The whole paragraph seems to be carefully structured around this centre because it is directly preceded by the phrase “в синюю бездну дня”, which is repeated altogether three times in this

¹⁴ Maria Carlson actually speaks of the “acoustic-semantic complex” of motifs in the novel, cf. “*The Silver Dove*,” *Andrey Bely – Spirit of Symbolism*, ed. John E. Malmstad (Ithaca and London, Cornell UP, 1987), 68-73.

¹⁵ Janecek claims that these structural elements are Bely’s favourite devices in creating the often rhythmic text of *Серебряный голубь* (93).

short passage: once in the first sentence, once in the last to form a frame, and once again, in the middle of the paragraph. Consequently, the “simple” description of a hot summer day proves to be a typical example of ornamental prose, a carefully structured text with a poem-like melody, terseness and figurativeness, without any superfluous words.

Az ezüst galamb

And now let us see Peterdi’s version of the same excerpt:

És szórta és szórta a levegő végtelen kékjébe, a nehéz kegyetlen szikrázó ragyogásba a hívó szavát a celebéjevói templom harangos tornya. Cikázott, szállt fölötte a fecske. A jó illatokkal kábító pünkösdi napja pedig meghintette mindenfelé a bokrot rózsaszínű vadrózsapihével. És hőség füllesztette a mellet, fénylett, mint az üveg, a szitakötő szárnya a tó felett, elvillant, fel a ragyogó mennyei kékbe, eltűnt a nagy mennyei pusztaságba. Izzadt tenyerével törölte gyöngyöző homlokát a buzgó falubéli, amint kapaszkodott fel a toronyba, megkogatni a harang ércnyelvét, megizzadni, megerőlködni az Úr dicsőségére. És szórta, szórta szép csengését a kék végtelenbe a celebéjevói harangos torony és cikázott, csicsorgett, ujjongott felette a fecske, négy kergetőző fecsképár. Híres szép falu Celebéjevo, majdnem város; csupa szép halom körülötte; meg rét... (Belij 1)

As far as the ornamentality of *Серебряный голубь* is concerned, the translator’s strategy includes the prioritisation of the lyrical qualities of the novel – equated primarily with its acoustic features – as opposed to its structuring leitmotifs. Peterdi reads Bely’s text as poetry created through the music of words. Therefore, in his version practically all the musical elements of ornamental prose can be found, among them the unusual structuring of sentences, rhythmic effects, exact and modified repetitions and caesuras, even the tendency for new coinages, but somehow “l’art pour l’art”, for their own sake, without a clear-cut sense of function and purpose. Probably because he found it almost impossible to render some aspects of the musicality of the text, such as alliterations or rhyming endings, in Hungarian, he applied a traditional translational practice and amplified the translatable aspects (Tellér 204-205) – unfortunately, he even exaggerated them. He often translates Bely’s unusual sentence structures, complete with inversions, clauses of purpose expressed with infinitives, parallel clauses and multiple semicolons, literally. What is more, he increases their number in comparison with the source text. Even Hungarian, a free word order language, seems to revolt against such usage, which, by the way, seems to be reminiscent of Peterdi’s own prose style. Bely’s functional repetitions sometimes turn into garrulousness in Peterdi’s text, for example when he uses instead of the original two verbs three in “cikázott, csicsorgett, ujjongott” – none of which really convey the meaning and atmosphere of the source text. Sometimes, in complete contrast, he does not repeat what he should, even if it would not break the norms of standard Hungarian usage. For instance, the partial

repetitions of the word-pairs *усердно–поусердствовать* and *потным–пропотеть* are completely lost in the Hungarian text, though they are an important source of the ironic-mocking overtone of narration at this point. Another type of repetition, rhythm, is so important for him, that for its sake he even eliminates the emphatic functional caesura in the centre of the passage. Bely does not use new coinages for their own sake, either: his “*клинъкала*” in the last sentence of the paragraph is both an onomatopoeic word and a modified repetition of the noun “*клики*” in the first line, as opposed to Peterdi’s “*harangos torony*”, which is simply a redundancy. He occasionally seems to forget that what with his new coinages, Bely’s text is ultimately still in Russian, or at least in a human language, for example when he creates the word “*megeőlködni*”.

As opposed to the exaggerated musicality of the text, tropes, which also serve the highlighting of leitmotifs, are somewhat pushed into the background in Peterdi’s version. This is the field where the limits of Peterdi’s talent become most obvious: just like in his free verse, he also finds it extremely difficult to come up with fully fledged figures of speech here. Consequently, he substitutes metaphors with similes and circumlocutions, or figures which convey different connotations from the source text. Thus, the metaphor “*стекленели*” turns into the simile “*fénylett, mint az üveg*”, another metaphor, “*писали [...] восьмёрки стрижи*”, is simply mistranslated as “*négy kergetőző fecsképar*”, while the synaesthesia of “*в голубой покой пустынь*” is transformed into the platitude of “*a nagy mennyei pusztaság*”. In the meantime, the structurally most emphatic metaphor of the passage, “*бездна*”, the image which identifies the depth of the skies with the depth of the lake and is a central leitmotif of the entire novel, simply gets lost, since the strictly exact three repetitions of the phrase “*в синюю бездну дня*” are substituted with hardly recognisable variants in the Hungarian text. Peterdi’s translation takes the novel, the language of which is economic and unbelievably polysemous, turning it into a lax and vague text. He also changes the style of the description: the fading-disappearing tropes leave behind a void, their absence changes the register of the text. For example, without the lofty “*в голубой покой пустынь*”, which clearly evokes the imagery of Symbolist poetry, the register of the whole paragraph is downgraded, it comes to resemble rather the pretentious experiments of a peasant turned versemonger – the “*narratorial mask*” of the village peasant which actually appears only in the next paragraph. The impression that the not exactly intelligent narrator cannot wholly control his medium is strengthened by the silly new coinages, like “*fülesztette*”, and unnecessary circumlocutions and repetitions – some of them the results of clear-cut mistranslations, like the phrase “*felette a fecske, négy kergetőző fecsképar*”.

Thus, the question of ornamentality has inevitably led to the issue of stylistic variety, form which it is inseparable. In the context of the whole novel Peterdi’s strategy ultimately results in the stylistic levelling and downgrading of the text. His exaggeration of the musical qualities of the novel – which are not equally strong in the case of all the “*narratorial masks*” and their related styles in

the source text – and his weakening of the power and economy of Bely’s imagery and systematic use of tropes in the lyrical sections proper, together with the strengthening of the folk-like tone make it even more difficult to distinguish the separate “narratorial masks” in the Hungarian version than in the source text. This stylistic levelling (cf. Popovič 150) is accompanied by a downgrading of registers, since on the one hand it is inevitably the highest, most poetical stylistic layer of the novel which suffers the most obvious losses in Peterdi’s translation, as the analysis of the excerpt above demonstrates. On the other hand, Hungarian readers might gain the most lasting impression of the anecdotic and folk-like story-telling manner of the village narrator, as if his limited vision and narrative competence strove to encompass the entire action and all the scenes of *Серебряный голубь*. In other words, another register in the novel undergoes a “stylistic strengthening” (cf. Popovič 149), which finally also contributes to a general sense of downgrading and “levelling” of the source text. Combined with the above-mentioned forced rhythmicality, it gradually makes readers feel as if they were reading some silly chastushka, as if Peterdi, what with his love for Russian literature, his devotion to its translation and his highly appreciative audience, for some bizarre reason had still produced an (unwitting) parody of *Серебряный голубь* in his *Az ezüst galamb*.

The Silver Dove

And now here is the same excerpt in Elsworth’s rendering:

Again and again, into the blue abyss of the day, hot and cruel in its brilliance, the Tselebeyevo bell-tower cast its plangent cries. In the air above it the martins fretted about. And heavy-scented Whitsuntide sprinkled the bushes with frail pink dogroses. The heat was stifling; dragonfly wings hung glassy in the heat above the pond, or soared into the heat of the day’s blue abyss, up into the blue serenity of the void. A perspiring villager assiduously smeared dust over his face with his sweat-soaked sleeve, as he dragged himself along to the bell-tower to swing the bell’s bronze clapper and sweat and toil to the glory of God. And again and again the Tselebeyevo bell-tower pealed out into the blue abyss of the day; and above it the martins darted with shrill cries, tracing figures of eight. It’s a fine village, Tselebeyevo, not far from the town, surrounded by hills and meadows [...]. (Bely, *The Silver Dove* 35)

From the point of view of ornamentality, Elsworth’s strategy produces a text which is dramatically different from Peterdi’s translation – or from the Russian source text, for that matter: it reads like the prose translation of poetic texts. The major reason for this is that, as his introduction has foreshadowed, he does not strive to render most of the acoustic qualities of Bely’s novel in English – the musical nature of the source text is not even suggested by his version. Accordingly, alliterations and rhymes, apart from the incidental “sweat-soaked sleeve”, do not appear in his version, either, but he does not compensate readers for this loss by increasing the number of other forms of repetition, like Peterdi.

Inversions, apart from standard topic-fronting, are also lacking from his text, obviously because of the fixed word order of English. Exact repetitions, based on a play with denotations and connotations or on the use of words derived from the same root, are also only incidental, therefore many of the exact repetitions of the source text are lost. Thus, from the effects supplying the rhythmic quality of the source text he maintains only the parallel structuring of clauses, which is absolutely standard English usage, but he does not force or exaggerate this device, either. Nevertheless, he notices and keeps the strict overall structure of the whole passage, and clearly indicates its “frame” and “centre” with the almost exact three-time repetition of “the blue abyss of the day”. As opposed to the almost total loss of the musical qualities of the source text, Elsworth’s translation much more “adequately” conveys the structure of leitmotifs in the novel – in fact, only something like a “skeleton” of leitmotifs remains from the Russian ornamental text. Elsworth achieves this effect by a relatively exact repetition of central images, like the fairly successful “abyss” for “бездна”, and by an incomparably more economic and stylistically more adequate translation of tropes, than Peterdi’s. For example, “the blue serenity of the void” is much closer in effect to the lofty synesthesia of the source text, than Peterdi’s commonplace circumlocution. Similarly, “martins darted with shrill cries, tracing figures of eight” is at least not a misreading of the Russian text, even though “tracing” does not necessarily associate “writing”, which is the denotation of the Russian verb at this place.

Since Elsworth is much more successful in rendering Bely’s images and tropes in his mother tongue than Peterdi, and therefore in conveying the highest stylistic register of the source text, one may expect that he also fares better with the differentiation of the registers and sociolects associated with the different “narratorial masks”. This, however, is only partly true: similarly to Peterdi’s, his text also levels the source text stylistically, but rather by upgrading than downgrading, finally to achieve something like a “Golden mean”. Just like in Peterdi’s case, the reasons are also twofold here. Firstly, however conscientiously he translates the images and tropes, the style of the lyrical digressions, which evokes the euphony and musicality of Symbolist poetry, is obviously not the same without the acoustic effects – the result is the neutralisation of a marked difference between standard prose and an ornamental text here. Secondly, his devices for the rendering of dialects and substandard sociolects are rather limited, therefore in his translation the speech of peasant characters and more importantly of the village narrator is much closer to standard usage than in the source text, as the transition at the beginning of the second paragraph clearly demonstrates. Therefore, Elsworth is at his best when he translates the small-town and aristocratic narrators’ ironic, highly conscious narrative voice, since these remain within the boundaries of the Russian literary language in the source text. Consequently, though the differentiation of the “narratorial masks” is also problematic in the case of the English version, Elsworth’s translation is definitely more successful than Peterdi’s in the sense

that it represents Bely's *Серебряный голубь* as a serious piece of writing, a work of art – even if only like a prose translation of an outstanding poem.

Conclusion

As the comparative analysis of the source text and its translations has shown, the problem areas of translating *Серебряный голубь*, a Russian Symbolist novel written in ornamental prose, are largely similar to the issues of translating poetry. And the two translators' principles – initial norms – part from each other exactly at this junction: while both of them regard the novel as a text bordering on prose poetry, Peterdi decides to translate it as such, while Elsworth opts for a prose translation. Put in practice, Peterdi's choice results in the exaggeration of some acoustic qualities of the source text in the Hungarian version, combined with a rather free handling of its actual contents and tropes in the interest of rendering its musical qualities, and probably with the translator's comparatively poor poetical talent. Striving to produce an absolutely "adequate" translation which is also an outstanding work of art, he fails exactly because he sets his sights too high. Taking all this into consideration, it is not surprising that even the open-minded audience of Hungarian literature in the 1920s could not digest the formal experimentations of ornamental prose in Peterdi's presentation, let alone incorporating its achievements into Hungarian literature. In the 1930s, however, several technical features of Bely's novel, such as elements of the stream-of-consciousness novel, the undermining of the authorial position and the lyrical quality of his prose appear as authentic developments in Krúdy's, Kosztolányi's or Szentkuthy's novels¹⁶. Nevertheless, "pure" ornamentality remained alien to Hungarian literature between the two WWs, the term itself is mentioned most often – if at all – with relation to Sándor Weöres's poetry. As opposed to Peterdi's ambitious enterprise, Elsworth's modest prose translation, written for an audience which has long been accustomed to accepting such solutions, clearly has its own – even if small – place on the "periphery" of the "literary polysystem" of the target culture. His definitely less "adequate" text keeps in focus the linguistic and literary norms of the target culture – and consequently it is at least a readable one. It still does justice to the source text in representing it as a work of art worthy of serious interest – something that Peterdi's version, with all its insistence on the priority of the source language and literature, cannot claim.

¹⁶ Cf. Gintli Tibor's analysis of "the loss of narratorial authority" in Krúdy's 1930 text, *Boldogult úrfikoromban* (Szegedy-Maszák—Veres 162-173); Szegedy-Maszák's article on "going beyond the novel form" in Kosztolányi's *Esti Kornél*, which was written between 1925 and 1933, and published in 1933 (Szegedy-Maszák—Veres 230-243); Rugási Gyula's study of Szentkuthy's *Prae* (1934), which awarded the author with the by-name "the Hungarian Joyce" (Szegedy-Maszák—Veres 310-321).

Works Cited

- Belij, Andrej. *Az ezüst galamb*. Trans. Peterdi István. Budapest: Genius, 1926.
- Bely, Andrey. *Petersburg*. Trans. Robert A. Maguire and John E. Malmstad. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana UP, 1978.
- . *The Silver Dove*. Trans. John Elsworth. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern UP, 2000.
- Bradbury, Malcolm and James McFarlane. "The Name and Nature of Modernism." *Modernism – A Guide to European Literature 1890-1930*. Ed. Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane. London: Penguin Books, 1991: 19-56.
- Carlson, Maria. "The Silver Dove." *Andrey Bely – Spirit of Symbolism*. Ed. John E. Malmstad. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1987: 60-95.
- Dobos István. *Alaktan és értelmezéstörténet – Novellatípusok a századforduló magyar irodalmában*. Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 1995.
- Elsworth, J. D. *Andrey Bely: A Critical Study of the Novels*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983.
- . "A Note on the Text and the Translation." *Andrey Bely. The Silver Dove*. Trans. John Elsworth. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern UP, 2000: 26-29.
- . "Introduction." *Andrey Bely. The Silver Dove*. Trans. John Elsworth. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern UP, 2000: 7-25.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem." *The Translation Studies Reader*. Second edition. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. New York and London: Routledge, 2004: 199-204.
- Janecek, Gerald. "Rhythm in Prose: The Special Case of Bely." *Andrey Bely – A Critical Review*. Ed. G. Janecek. Lexington, Kentucky, 1978: 86-102.
- Józan Ildikó. "Irodalom és fordítás." *A magyar irodalom története*. Vol. III. Ed. Szegedy-Maszák Mihály and Veres András. Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó, 2007: 52-68.
- Karancsy László. "Ornamentális próza és tudatregény." *A. Blok – A. Belij 100. (kerekasztal-konferencia)*. Debrecen: 1981: 131-138.
- Nyugat 1908-1941. Egy irodalmi legenda – digitálisan*. CD-ROM. Budapest: Arcanum adatbázis, 1992-93.
- Peterdi István. "Bevezetés." Andrej Belij. *Az ezüst galamb*. Trans. Peterdi István. Budapest: Genius, 1926: v-viii.
- "Peterdi István." *Magyar Életrajzi Lexikon 1000-1990*. Ed. in chief Kenyeres Ágnes. <http://mit-hol.oszk.hu/00300/00355/html/ABC11587/12112.htm>.
- Popovič, Anton. *A műfordítás elmélete*. Trans. Zsilka Tibor. Bratislava: Madách, 1980.
- Somlyó György. "Két szó között – Megjegyzések a fordítás poétikájához." *A műfordítás ma – Tanulmányok*. Ed. Bart István and Rákos Sándor. Budapest: Gondolat, 1981: 102-146.
- Szabolcsi Miklós, ed. *A magyar irodalom története*. Vol. 6. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1966.

- Szegedy-Maszák Mihály and Veres András, eds. *A magyar irodalom története*. Budapest, Gondolat Kiadó, 2007.
- Szerb Antal. *Magyar irodalom történet*. Eleventh edition. Budapest: Magvető, s. a.
- Szilárd Léna. *Andrej Belij és az orosz szimbolista regény poétikája*. Budapest: Széphalom Könyvműhely, 2001.
- . "A szimbolizmus és a vele határos jelenségek." *Az orosz irodalom története a kezdetektől 1940-ig*. Ed. Zöldhelyi Zsuzsa. *Az orosz irodalom története*. Vol. I. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó, 1997: 197-234.
- . "Орнаментальность/Орнаментализм." *Russian Literature XIX* (1986): 65-78.
- Tellér Gyula. "Versstruktúra és versfordítás." *A műfordítás ma – Tanulmányok*. Ed. Bart István and Rákos Sándor. Budapest: Gondolat, 1981: 147-215.
- Toury, Gideon. "Norms in Translation." *The Translation Studies Reader*. Second edition. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. New York and London: Routledge, 2004: 205-218.
- Белый, Андрей. *Петербург*. Paris: Booking International, 1994.
- . *Серебряный голубь. Сочинения*. Ed., introduction and notes Н. А. Богомолов. Москва: Лаком-книга, 2001: 158-394.
- . *Символизм как миропонимание*. Ed., introduction and notes Л. А. Сугай. Москва: Республика, 1994.
- Козьменко, М. "Автор и герой повести *Серебряный голубь*." Андрей Белый. *Серебряный голубь*. Москва: Художественная литература, 1989: 5-29.
- Лавров, А. В. *Андрей Белый в 1900-е годы*. Москва: Новое литературное обозрение, 1995.
- Рейхманн, Ангелика. "Профанированные 'Священные цвета' – *Сер(еб)рян(ь)ый голубь* Андрея Белого." *Slavica XXVIII* (1997): 117-133.
- Сёке Каталин. "Усадьба Гуголево – Символистская трактовка дворянской культуры в романе Андрея Белого *Серебряный голубь*." *Научные издания Московского Венгерского Колледжа I* (2001): 195-206.
- Эткинд, А. *Хлыст*. Москва: Новое литературное обозрение, 1998.