

# Translation of a Poetic Text as an Expression of the National Culture

Anna Valcerová

*Translated by Diana Krajňáková*

Drawing on the rudimentary development processes in literary history, historical poetics reveals that the successive cultural-historical periods appear to stand in opposition to each other; however, those immediately preceding and following a particular literary period are inherently interrelated. This enables us to illustrate the literary development dynamics in broadest outline as well as it evinces the enrichment of individual periods by the opposite tendencies which precede them in literary history. The basic development model (see Figure 1) is applied in framing history of translation which draws on history of world literature, foreign national literatures and primarily native literature fulfilling the function of a receiving literary setting. On that account, history of translation employs the techniques of historical poetics, history of national literature, literary comparatistics, theory of translation and translation criticism in individual periods. Katarína Bednárová, based on *Dejiny slovenskej literatúry/History of Slovak Literature* by Stanislav Šmatlák, has in her introductory study to *Slovník slovenských prekladateľov/The Dictionary of Slovak Translators* (2015) investigated the chronological development of translation techniques of Slovak literary translators in the most detailed and objective way so far. The translation into the Slovak language may not be, according to her, identified until the period of Slovak national revival starting with the period of Classicism which is characteristic of exotization, the preference for foreign models (Hollý's hexameter) and returns to the past (the translation of classical authors). Followed by Romanticism, the process of naturalization (Dobšinský's translations) seems to be dominant here together with the emphasis on the then authors (Goethe, Schiller, Polish and Russian poets and others). This 19<sup>th</sup>-century literary turn is evident and similar to the twist from Realism to Modernism at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (traditional – modern) as well as to the return to traditionalism by the beginning of the 1940s. These particular turning points including a progressive change towards modernization and exotization in the late 50s, as a matter of fact, enable the development of translation to be qualitatively improved.

|                      |                                      |                     |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|
| CLASSICAL LITERATURE | (Plato) symbols of a greater reality | (Aristotle) mimesis |
| Medieval Literature  |                                      |                     |
| Baroque              |                                      | Renaissance         |
| Romanticism          |                                      | Classicism          |
| MODERNISM            |                                      | Realism             |
| Symbolism            |                                      | Dadaism             |
| Expressionism        |                                      | Futurism            |
| Surrealism           |                                      | Constructivism      |
| Magic Realism        |                                      | Abstractionism      |
| POSTMODERNISM        |                                      |                     |

Figure 1

Based on the four investigated categories, the primary aim of the present study is further narrowed down to point out the crucial milestones in poetry translation within the Slovak setting after 1945.

Looking at the general historical context, the Slovak literary setting appears to follow the alternation of basic development tendencies and processes characteristic of world literature. For instance, during the inter-war period, the preference for foreign elements introduced to the national literary context and the impact of translation on the development of national poetry are most evident. On the other hand, in the course of WWII and the period following it (up to 1957), the emphasis turns to the principles of source oriented translation and naturalization (M. Rázusová-Martáková, Z. Jesenská, J. Ferenčík).

Jozef Felix in *Tri pohľady na Rostandovho Cyrana z Bergeracu/Three Views on Rostand's Cyrano de Bergerac* (1939) considers the translation of Mária Rázusová-Martáková to be “one of the most outstanding translations published in Slovakia” (1987, 287). His favorable view on her work is even intensified in his article *Lyrický portrét Cyrana z Bergeracu/Lyrical Portrayal of Cyrano de Bergerac* (1940) in which he states “Rázusová-Martáková's Slovak translation of Rostand's Cyrano de Bergerac is a masterpiece which ranks among the most significant translations in the Slovak post-war literature” (1987, 293). In his paper *Na margo slovenského prekladu Rostandovho Cyrana/A few Notes on the Slovak Translation of Rostand's Cyrano* (1939), Felix interprets the aesthetic qualities of her remarkable translation: “In Cyrano de Bergerac, there are, for instance, parts in the Gascon dialect amongst which one is wittily translated by Rázusová-Martáková into the Western Slovak dialect typical of rural areas, e.g. ‘Ná... a to je nos? Ba nyjé ludé! Najskoreč burgyna to, lebo dyna bude!’ [...]”

“Although the creativity of Rostand's language is not present in Rázusová-Martáková's translation, his expressive linguistic diversity is substituted by expressive Slovak in such a way that the message of *Cyrano de Bergerac* is not violated” (1987, 303-305). In other words, Felix noticeably prefers the criterion of naturalization to exoticization in his translation criticism at the turn of the 1950s. Further, he compares the Slovak translation of *Cyrano* with the Czech translation by Jaroslav Vrchlický who, contrariwise, employs the French calques such as “*patrola, lanceta, kordon, parasol*” deliberately underlining the process of exoticization, thus prefers foreign to national. In the very same period, Mária Rázusová-Martáková “draws on the rich demotic lexicon and its less frequent words which subsequently give the vivid impression in the context of translation [...] and depict the original work in an exceptionally excellent way [...] ‘*zamatka, svätuškár, štebotnica, dostávať, pípeť, viselec, šudier, skydo, dobiedzač, mumaj, trlo, zrafať, talhaj, oblina, sedmoslivkár, krpčiar* etc.” (Felix 1987, 306). These words are of rural provenience and are either not used in the Slovak language that time or sit on the periphery of its lexicon. It is the category of dialectal words which apparently fall under the most ageing linguistic elements in translations. The process of naturalization in translations predominates in the 1940s and keeps its hegemonic position in the first half of the 1950s in forms of poetry, prose as well as drama. On the basis of these translations, preferring naturalization to exoticization, Ján Ferenčík (1982) elaborates the well-known principles of Slovak translation school and shapes the following three decades, hence the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s. The iconic translator of this school is Zora Jesenská whose translation of Yesenin's poem *Anna Snegina* (1957), similarly to the original, illustrates the tendency for vernacular, authentic and rare words in standard Slovak, which Yesenin uses to characterize the rural setting, especially in the early stages of his literary work. The authentic dialectal words in Jesenská's translation work on the effective functional level; however they seem to be sometimes overused. Her translation is full of examples of splendid and unusual word choices including the combinations of calques and productive suffixes, especially when describing the battles, e.g. “*papl'uha, beťár, richtár je trúp, národ je huňový, nebude štúrat, ved' bieda ich škrela, psota ich morí, bistu, mrcha chvíle, zahriebli, skvárili, planiga, brýzga, zachloštil, furták, chatřčka, psí brech, stonoha, novô, onô, netknúť sa zeme, luna sa škl'abí, jazmín obsuval lesičku, oflinok, štrimfle, ozembuch, mužíci z Radovej Kriušanom napopáckali, Kerenskij nad Ruskom si zakalifoval*”.

By way of comparing her version of Yesenin's *Anna Snegina* with the Czech translation by Josef Hora (1927) who opts for the iambic alternative to the original, Jesenská's translation appears to be more folkloric and expressive and thus classified into the poetics of Slovak Realism rather than Modernism.

On the one hand, the readership is fascinated by the translator's rich and originally demotic vocabulary, which is later frequently weakened by the editing; on the other hand, her authentic language approximates this type of poem to the genre of Hviezdoslav's epic poems *Ežo* and *Gábor Vikolinský*, the only genre form of

lyrical-epic poem set in rural setting within the Slovak literature at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Furthermore, the strong influence of form on semantics is evident here since Jesenská tends to employ amphibrach that is predominantly evinced in the translation of metaphors and rhyme.

In 1958, Ľubomír Feldek introduces the manifest calling for a change in translation in the journal *Mladá tvorba* [*Young Creation*] in which he promotes the process of modernization. This is followed by the period of experimentation in the national poetry as well as translations. The subsequent complex change on euphonic, rhythmic, figurative and linguistic levels of a poetic text is apparent at this point. On its basis, Válek's translations of P. Verlaine, R. M. Rilke, A. Voznesensky and Feldek's translation of V. V. Mayakovsky, B. I. Antonych, R. Jeffers and Malay pantuns arise... Many Concretists, particularly Ján Stacho, translate Jean Arthur Rimbaud, Jozef Mihalkovič focuses on the translations of Blaise Cendrars, Henri Michaux, William Carlos Williams, J. Šimonovič tends to translate Lorca and many other Spanish-writing poets. The important point here is the fact that translators themselves analyze the techniques of translation and draw up their own experience with translating modern poetry. The most striking contribution to translation practice as well as poetics is provided by Ľ. Feldek in his article in *Mladá tvorba/Young Creation* (1958), later published in the book *Z reči do reči/From Language to Language* (1977), which questions the principle of V. Turčány who draws his translation poetics on personal experience from translating the classical authors (Dante, Petrarch, troubadours, later S. Prudhomme...). Ľubomír Feldek (in connection with innovative Czech translations) postulates so-called translation of "principle", i.e. an intentional emphasis on the underlying features of the original and its considerable vivification and modernization, especially on the linguistic level, and on approximating the style of translated author to the present-day colloquial style representing a deliberate move on the temporal axis.

Following the year 1957, in the 1960s in particular, experimentation stressing foreign, new and different, being a reaction to the preceding period, predominates in the national poetry as well as translations. The first issue of the journal *Revue svetovej literatúry/Revue of World Literature* starts with the essay of Miroslav Válek dedicated to Andrei Voznesensky whose *Triangular Pear* is translated and published in 1964. Neoconstructivist theme and imagery of his poetry, the significant inspiration by Beat generation and the motif of America stand in a stark opposition to Jesenská's translations:

Original:

*Avtoportret moj, retorta neona, apostol nebesnych vorot –  
Aeroport!  
Brezžat d'juralevyje vitraži,  
Točno rentgenovskij snimok duši.  
Kak eto strašno, kogda v tebe nebo stoit*

*V tlejuščich trassach  
Neobyknovených stolic!*

Literal Slovak translation:

*Autoportrét môj, trubica neónu, apoštol nebeských vrát –  
letisko!  
Ligocú sa duralové sklá  
ako röntgenový snímok duše.  
Aké je to hrozné, keď v tebe nebo stojí  
v tlejúcich trasách  
nezvyčajných hlavných miest!*

Literal English translation:

*My self-portrait, neon tube, the apostle of heaven gate –  
Airport!  
Duralumin glass is glittering,  
Like an X-ray picture of soul.  
How horrible it is when heaven is standing in you  
In smoldering routes  
Of unusual capital cities!*

Slovak translation:

*Svieti slnko s neónom, môj portrét, portier  
nebeských vrát, z ktorých sa nebo  
pretislo,  
letisko!*

*Úsvit skla vo dverách, duralový plam  
röntgenový snímok duše visí tam.*

Czech translation:

*Ty apoštole letů, křivule neonu, ty moje zrcadloviště –  
letiště!  
Duralovými žebry koše  
Svítilíš jak rentgenogram duše.  
Strašný je snímek.  
Nebe v tobě stojí  
a doutnáky linek  
divných metropolí.*

The acoustically and semantically dense metaphor of “*avtoportret – retorta – vorot – aeroport*” is based on multiple confrontations (of identity and difference) of sounds and meanings in words entering the reciprocal relation (self-portrait – neon tube – gate – airport). On this basis, the semantic connection given by elaborated metaphorical association arises: we are at the airport in New York, the glass door opens resembling a neon tube via the association of glass in which the self-portrait of the poet appears, his real face, the face of a modern man who has a close relation to the architecture of modern city. In the Slovak translation, the metathesis of Russian words is replaced by the metathesis of Slovak words “*portrét – portier*” and the rhyme of “*letisko – pretislo*” which are not such semantically and reciprocally motivated than in the original. The translator inserts almost a half of verse to the source text in order to keep the basic meanings and relations encoded in the original. The Czech version by Václav Daněk moreover deprives his translation of the original double acoustic metathesis that, more than in the Slovak translation, weakens the semantic relation of author – airport as well as neon tube, “*křivule*”. The concentration of more meanings in a verse, polyphony and their metathetical reciprocity are violated; it is rather a realistic, non-metaphorical and acoustically poorer description of the airport in New York and its cultural setting. Weakened complex acoustic relations, underlining the complexity of semantic-spatial connections of Voznesensky's poetry, lead in the Czech translation to the reduction of semantic complexity and partially to the deprivation of semantic and acoustic reciprocity, which is part and parcel of Voznesensky's poetics following the futuristic ideas of early Mayakovsky and Khlebnikov.

Václav Daněk occasionally overuses the modernization of translation and deprives the text of concreteness and plasticity essential for the lyrical text, thus after a lapse of time, his translation appears to be excessively general. The intentional modernization brings about faster ageing of translation since it is a result of individual translator's word-formation which is neither based on the natural character of the Czech language nor evokes the natural concrete associations. Válek's translation of Voznesensky in the first half of the 1960s, in form of an artistic alternative initiating the tendencies of modernization in Slovak poetry, plays a crucial role in Slovakia. Daněk's translation of Voznesensky is only one of many translations of the time which inform on the then movements in the Russian literature. The excessive modernization violating the semantic field of the original thus gives the similar impression as the inappropriate historization in translation (Valcerová 1999).

The 1970s and 1980s connected with the “normalization” suppress the natural hunger of literature of the time for a new and modern expression. What seems to be impossible in the national literature is at least feasible in translations, especially via the vivification movement (erotic as well as some satirical-political themes, e.g. Štrasser's translation of Krylov's *Fables* (1988)). However, so-called realistic school officially predominates here, particularly the translations of classical authors, while a

number of standard and substandard translations written to order emerge mainly from the socialistic literature.

Apart from the lexical vivification, it is also the key element of intonation phrasing in poetic language, underlining the rhythmical tone of text expressed in short segments, which is frequently employed in translations of Lermontov by J. Štrasser; Pushkin's poems, particularly the political satire, by Feldek; and of M. Tsvetaeva's lyric poetry by J. Zambor. In translations of poetry in Slovakia after 1957, within vivification translations up to 1989, the ideal goal appears not to be a faithful philological or realistic translation transferring all necessary linguistic and cultural differences. In contrast, it is the vivification which adapts translation and its message to the cultural situation of the time. Prominent translators tend to reflect the then cultural context, phraseology as well as feelings and views. However, the option for such a translation method is to be motivated by the original, not employed autonomically in order to avoid the transparent modernization and inartistic impression. Within this type of translation, it was especially the tendency for vivid, colloquial language as well as for exploring the effect of individual levels of a poetic text and their interconnection. A great number of translations thus mirror the changes in national lyric poetry and dynamic development of spoken Slovak in the course of the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s towards the modern universally developed language able to determine principal ideological movements of the modern period (Valcerová 2000).

Paradoxically, the translation tendency for vivification steps back after 1989 and translators happen not to fulfill the functions primarily characteristic of national literature anymore, often including the socio-critical ones. Translation turns to fulfill its inherent functions and appears to be in the service of the original author; it aims at approximating to him or her on all levels of the poetic text – euphonic, rhythmic, rhyme and semantic level. What is more, translators endeavor to simulate the literary features absent from the national literature (anapest and amphibrach on the rhythmic level). The high-quality translations of poetic texts – be they classical or modern – are relatively rare, therefore they happen to be more outstanding in the mass of imported literature of frequently “poor” aesthetic quality (Zambor's Pushkin 2000 and Achmatovová 2002; Andričík's Blake 2004).

Both translators model in shorter poems of the aforementioned authors, which share anapestic or amphibrachic rhythm, their rhythmical imitation (cf. Zambor 2000; Andričík 2004).

William Blake: Ah! Sun-flower

*Ah Sun-flower! weary of time, Who countest the steps of the Sun:  
Seeking after that sweet golden clime  
Where the travellers journey is done.*

*Where the Youth pined away with desire,*

*And the pale Virgin shrouded in snow:  
Arise from their graves and aspire,  
Where my Sun-flower wishes to go.*

### Slničnica

|  |               |            |
|--|---------------|------------|
| <i>Kvet slnka, už ustatý z dní,</i>          | XXx xXx xX    | amphibrach |
| <i>Keď rátal s ním každý krok ciest,</i>     | xXx xXx XX    | amphibrach |
| <i>hľadá kraj, celý ozlátený,</i>            | xxX XxX xxX   | anapest    |
| <i>kam náš pútnik sa musí vždy zniest'.</i>  | xxX xxX xxX   | anapest    |
| <i>Tam, kde chlapec, čo od túžby zľahol,</i> | xxX xxX xxX x | anapest    |
| <i>bledá panna cez snehový plášť</i>         | xxX xxX xxX   | anapest    |
| <i>sa dvíhajú z hrobov, tam nahor</i>        | xXx xXx xXx   | amphibrach |
| <i>moja slnečnica túži rást'.</i>            | XxX xxx xxX   | anapest    |

In this poem, there is the evident upward movement of meanings; the sunflower embodies a fierce power of nature and, on the figurative level, human desire to overcome the obstacles. Here, it is the rhythmic variability which gets in this vertical way towards the Sun and freedom and makes it more difficult. In the original, the natural relations, which symbolize the human desire for growth, freedom, independence and success obstructed by actual living conditions and rhythmic variability, are expressed by way of the alternation of amphibrach and anapest underlining the variable cycle of life. However, this variability seems to be lost via mechanical iambic translation. On that account, the translator Marián Andričík elaborates on the resources of his own language and by means of substitutive, however existing linguistic elements in Slovak (unstressed prepositions preceding a polysyllabic word, unstressed enclitics, quantity) substitutes the original rhythmic variability drawing on the power of rhythmic impulse of meter.

### Záhrada lásky

|  |               |            |
|--|---------------|------------|
| <i>Do záhrady lásky som šiel</i>           | xXx xXx xX    | amphibrach |
| <i>a uprostred po prvýkrát</i>             | xXx xXx xX    | amphibrach |
| <i>tam v tráve, kde rád som sa hral,</i>   | xXx xXx xX    | amphibrach |
| <i>som uvidel kaplnku stáť.</i>            | xXx xXx xX    | amphibrach |
| <i>A k tej kaplnke zavretý vchod,</i>      | xxX xxX xxX   | anapest    |
| <i>nápis na dverách: Nevojdeš sem;</i>     | XxX xxX xxX   | anapest    |
| <i>nuž som zrak uprel k záhrade lásky,</i> | xxX XxX xxX x | anapest    |
| <i>kde kvety vždy posiali zem.</i>         | xXx xXx xX    | amphibrach |
| <i>A tam čo vidím: za hrobom hrob</i>      | xXx XXx xXx   | amphibrach |
| <i>a náhrobky namiesto kvetov.</i>         | xXx xXx xXx   | amphibrach |

|   |                 |            |
|---|-----------------|------------|
| <i>A kňazov, čerň rúch, a z modlitieb kruh,</i> | xXx xXx Xxx X   | amphibrach |
| <i>čo do prútov ruží mi spútal sny, túžby.</i>  | xXx xXx xXx xXx | amphibrach |

In the translation of the second poem introduced here, the alternation of amphibrach and anapest seems to jointly construct a circle which embraces the lyrical subject and from which the romantic hero cannot escape. In the last two verses, the rhythm is deliberately violated which is connected with a tragic climax reflecting the aforementioned impossibility to escape. On the other hand, the translator employs the internal rhymes of “*rúch – kruh*” and “*ruží – túžby*” by way of which he compensates the rhythmic violations. The rhythmic discordance and increased rhyme harmony complement one another and close the circle of text. In the translation above, the focus is intentionally put on the rhythm rather than on meter in order to point out its irregularities. (The possibility to place the stress in Russian and English on the first syllable in anapest and amphibrach is further discussed by Žirmunskij 1980; Zambor 2000; Andričik 2004.)

Marián Andričik decently makes use of and qualitatively improves the experiments further employed in the translations of Pasternak by L. Novomeský, Yesenin's *Anna Snegina* by Z. Jesenská, classical poetry by V. Turčány and V. Mihálik, Voznesensky by M. Válek, Šafárik's *Tatranská múza so slovanskou lýrou/The Muse of Tatra with a Slavonic Lyre* (1986) by Ľ. Feldek, Vysotsky's lyrics by L. Vadkertiová and Akhmatova by J. Zambor. All these translators work within the realms of the Slovak language possibilities and set gradually higher standards regarding the national artistic mastery of poetry translation.

After 1945, it is the traditional principle of naturalization based on the national translation tradition of classical, especially Russian literature which enables the introduction of new values by way of translating new, modern authors. It brings about modern tendencies penetrating a relatively new and still developing system of values and methods (particularly the translation of classical prose and drama).

It is the traditional, newly established and canonical basis which can underpin the systemic experiment – exoticization, emphasizing the foreign elements, which predominates in translations of modern authors, mainly in poetry in the 1960s. This turning point seems to be crucial and vivification, modernization and introduction of foreign elements into the national context appear to be present up to the period of so-called normalization since on the social as well as cultural level, normalization represents an artificial intervention to the structure within the society and mainly the culture. Exoticization and modernization are also evident in the 1970s and 1980s, even after 1989; however the emphasis is officially put on the traditional values.

After 1989, there is a gradual shift towards the well-balanced situation between modern and traditional, foreign and national tendencies. At this point, translation fulfills its inherent functions thanks to the new social and cultural conditions as well as to language development and it starts to approximate to the original author's poetics, thus happens not to fulfill substitutive social functions. (Another point in case is functioning of market mechanism which deliberately favors

the translations of popular literature at the expense of more demanding translation challenges.) However in order to get to this phase of literary translation, it had to go through the complex development in the course of a half-century: it experienced the period of naturalization characteristic of the emphasis on national literary tradition (Slovak translation school representing its peak) – the period of exotization typical of the focus on foreign elements, especially modern authors, which is in its first phase closely connected with the predominance of historization and national tradition and secondly with the preponderance of modernization and influence of other cultures on translation.

What is more, the aforementioned basic phases bring about the unprecedented Slovak language development on the European level – which is able to determine the complex concepts and a wide range of notions arising out of different domains of life as well as languages on the level appropriate to the then situation. The process, which lasts several centuries in other cultures and languages, develops within the minor cultures, such as the Slovak cultural setting, more rapidly, in the course of a few decades.

This situation, however, emerges on the basis of the social ruptures. Although the standard Slovak language dates back to 1843, it previously drew on other variants (so-called *bernoľakovčina* based on Western Slovak dialects or biblical Czech language); based on the Central Slovak dialects, it was progressively modified, but could not be officially used later. In Austria-Hungary, Hungarian was ordained, however the majority of lower social classes could not speak it; what is more, authors writing in their mother tongue as well as translators were persecuted that time.

After 1918, the situation changes with the establishment of Czechoslovakia, characteristic of the Czech culture predominance, which is on benefit to the Slovak culture too, but the intellectual class is still relatively limited. The Slovak language of translations is influenced by dialects and its movement towards Russian is in a slow progress, the translations from Hungarian and French are the most frequent. The language of translations is rather heterogeneous; the lack of Slovak translations tends to be replaced by the Czech translations.

The situation after 1945 seems to be striking too as the opposite processes impact on the society again. Democracy comes into power, the masses are provided with education, the unprecedented industrialization of Slovakia is evinced, but free spirit, present after the WWII (1945 – 1948), is hampered by the ideology. After 1948, translating is again focused on Russian, but the world classical literature is thanks to the leading figures (J. Felix; SPKK; Slovak translation school) still translated and translations happen to have a crucial role in enriching the lexis of standard Slovak.

This elaborated basis thus gives a green light to experiments after 1956 representing the period of experimentation including the translations of the authors of Avant-garde; in the translation of poetry, the new tendencies involve the changes in

structure of individual levels of a poetic text as well as new syntheses influencing the national poetry, too.

## Works Cited

- Achmatovová, A. (2002) Biely krdel'. Trans. Ján Zambor. Košice: Pezolt, ISBN 80-887-9739-X.
- Andričik, M. (2004) K poetike umeleckého prekladu. Levoča: Modrý Peter, ISBN 80-855-1559-8.
- Blake, W. (2004) Počul som spievať anjela. Trans. Marián Andričik. Bratislava: Svetový spisovateľ, ISBN 80-220-1287-4.
- Feldek, Ľ. (1977) Z reči do reči. Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ.
- Felix, J. (1987) Na cestách s veľkým. Vybrané spisy Jozefa Felixa. Vol. 3. Bratislava: Tatran.
- Ferenčík, J. (1982) Kontexty prekladu. Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ.
- Gromová, E. (2003) Teória a didaktika prekladu. Nitra: FF UKF, ISBN 80-805-0587-X.
- Valcerová-Bacigálová, A. (1999) Vzťah významu a tvaru v preklade poézie. Prešov: FF PU, ISBN 80-887-2263-2.
- Valcerová, A. (2000) V labyrinte vzťahov. Prešov: FF PU, ISBN 80-806-8011-6.
- Voznesenskij, A. (1964) Antimiry. Moscow: Molodaja gvardija.
- Voznesenskij, A. (1964) Trojuhelníková hruška. Trans. Václav Daněk. Prague: SNKLU.
- Voznesenskij, A. (1964) Trojuhelníková hruška. Trans. Miroslav Válek. Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ.
- Voznesenskij, A. (1968) Achillovo srdce. Trans. Václav Daněk. Prague: Svět sovietů.
- Zambor, J. (2000) Preklad ako umenie. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského, ISBN 80-223-1407-2.

## Summary

### Translation of a Poetic Text as an Expression of the National Culture

Terms such as naturalization, exotization, modernization and creolization were used by Anton Popovič in the so-called Holmes' crisis in the 1970s and they have since gone on to become a staple of Slovak translation theory. They rank among the most frequent translation theory and translation criticism terms after equivalence and shifts. Moreover, they may be used when drawing up Slovak history of translation in the 20<sup>th</sup> century as crucial. As individual periods in translation studies in our country take their turns, one of these tendencies always comes to the fore as a dominant one. After a clear dominance of naturalizing tendencies in the 1950s, when classic translations were preponderant, a predominance of up-dated translations appeared. This was introduced by Feldek's manifestation appearance in Mladá tvorba at the end of the 1950s and throughout the 1960s by a dominance of modern literature. This alternation of dominant tendencies is by no means mechanical, but it is applicable also in hindsight. Whereas in the period of Realism naturalization tendencies (Kukučín, Hviezdoslav) seem dominant, the period of Modernism foregrounds those of exotization (Roy, Krasko). However, in the inter-war period, exotization takes already turns with naturalization (Jesenský, Jesenská, Rázusová-Martáková). J. Felix praises these translations although with respect to historization and modernization he is in favor of so-called vivification, i.e. adapting translation to an epoch in which it originated as well as a reader. Furthermore, Surrealists in the period of the Second World War and shortly before it seem to prefer modernization

and exotization besides naturalizing translations. Thus, they bridge the period of naturalization from the 1950s to the 1960s when they become closer with the starting generation of Concretists. Again, after 1968 modernization is not pushed to the background mechanically; prime translations are still modernizing or up-dated. After 1989, gradually after a wave of exotization, especially Americanization (shortly after the Revolution), attenuation of the modernizing and exoticizing methods in supreme translations, those of poems, in particular, may be observed, in contrast to what was referred to by Felix as vivification on a temporal axis and creolization, i.e. mixing of cultures, by Popovič. This is called an attenuated or classicist translation method; translation fulfils its basic role, it approximates to the style of a translated author and is at his service.

### **About the Author**

Professor PhDr. Anna Valcerová, CSc. is a poet, translator, translation studies expert and literary critic. In her research, she focuses mainly on translation criticism and theory, comparative theory of verse and literary comparatistics in general, but she also addresses other issues (e.g. Slovak and Czech poetry and prose). Since 2005, Anna Valcerová has been the head of the Institute of Translation and Interpreting.