"Eugene Onegin" in the English-speaking Linguacultural Space

N. M. Nesterova & Y. K. Popova
Perm National Research Polytechnic University, Russia.

Abstract
The article is devoted to the study of the way in which A.S. Pushkin's verse novel "Eugene Onegin" is presented in the modern English-speaking linguacultural space. The most famous English-language verse translations by C. Johnston, J. Falen, D. Hofstadter and S. Mitchell, V. Nabokov's prose-rhythmized translation and R. Clarke's prose translation, have been chosen as research materials. In addition to literary (interlingual) translations, the British-American adaptation of the film "Eugene Onegin" directed by Martha Fiennes and the translation of this film into the Russian language became the material for the analysis. The analysis of this film allowed identifying the specifics of three types of translation of Pushkin's text – intralinguistic, interlingual and inter-semiotic ones. As a result of the conducted study, the authors have come to the conclusion that nowadays the place of the Russian poet and his main work in the English-speaking linguacultural space is becoming more and more noticeable and significant, while the novel "Eugene Onegin" acquires a status of a "powerful text", which forms the intertextual space around itself.

Keywords: translation, translatability (untranslatability), inter-semiotic translation, domestication, foreignization, stylization.

Introduction

The verse novel "Eugene Onegin" occupies a special place in a number of Pushkin's works. It is generally accepted that this text, significant for national culture, can be regarded as a source of all Russian prose of the nineteenth century. A.S. Pushkin's "Onegin" is based on the ideological-informative and artistic foundations, which later determined the specifics of the Russian novel as a whole. According to the famous literary critic and culturologist Yuri Mikhailovich Lotman, Pushkin, in "Eugene Onegin",

> "created not only a novel but also a formula of the Russian novel. This formula formed the basis of the whole subsequent tradition of Russian realism. Turgenev, Goncharov, Tolstoy, and Dostoevsky studied the possibilities hidden in it" (Lotman, 1988).

"Eugene Onegin" can be called a truly innovative work. The work on the novel, filled with the creative search, took more than seven years from Pushkin. This resulted in a plot, which was fundamentally new to Russian literature of that time, a new type of a hero and a new genre. While describing the literary situation of the 1820s in Russia, Yu.M. Lotman noted "in order to make the first step in world literature it was necessary to make a revolution in Russian literature" (Lotman, 1988). And, relying on the experience of the European and the Russian cultural traditions, it was Pushkin who managed to make such a "revolution".

The innovativeness in "Eugene Onegin" is also explained by a fundamentally new attitude to the artistic world. The author demonstratively rejected traditional stylistic characteristics, combining the vocabulary of different stylistic registers in one context. As a result, speech becomes more variable, the text gets rid of the so-called stylistic automatism, and the contrast of the "high" and "low" style is felt by the reader much more vividly. The techniques of using "someone else's word" in the text of the novel are fundamentally new. The abundance of citations, allusions, hints, and omissions neither clutters up the text nor obscures its content, but they make the reader's cultural memory work and turn the reading process into a kind of an intellectual game.

In "Eugene Onegin", Pushkin managed to achieve the effect of destroying the reader's expectations set by the whole previous artistic experience. The novel refutes the traditional genre scheme and the structure of the text is based on the principle of unresolved contradictions. This artistic concept is declared by the author in the introduction of the novel given in Table 1:

Table 1.

A fragment of A.S. Pushkin's novel "Eugene Onegin" and examples of its translation into English		
A fragment of A.S. Pushkin's novel "Eugene Onegin"	Translation by V. Nabokov	Translation by S. Mitchell
Primi sobranie pyostrykh glav, *Polusmeshnykh, poly-pechalnykh,* *Prostonarodnykh, idealnykh...* (Pushkin, 1982)	...take this collection of variegated chapters: half droll, half sad, plain-folk, ideal... (Nabokov, 1990)	Accept these chapters and their rhymes, Half-comic and half-melancholic, Ideal and down-to-earth bucolic.... (Mitchel, 2008)

Certainly, it is impossible to translate in full such a complex poetic structure based on switching intonations and playing with cultural symbols, filled with associations and citations, into a foreign language. Yu.M. Lotman notes the following not without reason: "Eugene Onegin" is "certainly the most complicated work of Russian literature, which loses much at translation" (Lotman, 1988). This can be seen in the above translations: Pushkin's verses lose their lightness; Pushkin's sound recording, which is also built on alliteration, is also lost (see the first line where a sound "**r**" is repeated – *Primi sob**r**anie pyost**r**ykh glav*).

The uniqueness of Pushkin's creation, which made him "untranslatable", is a reason why the greatest Russian poet did not take the place he should have taken in world literature. The purpose of this study is to analyze the way "Eugene Onegin" is represented in the modern English-speaking linguacultural space.

2. Material and methods

This work is a comparative analysis of the original text by Pushkin and its various presentations in English-language. The term "presentation" (which seems to us rather suitable) was used by a famous translation theorist Gideon Toury, who wrote that translation is "a presentation in that language/culture of another pre-existing text in some other language, belonging to some other culture and occupying a definite position within it" (Toury, 1995). Such translations-presentations

in the case of "Eugene Onegin" include both interlingual (poetic and prosaic) and inter-semiotic translations, if we take R. Jacobson's classification.

It is known that there is a lot of literary English-language presentations of Pushkin's verse novel. The most famous English versions of Charles Johnston (1977), James Falen (1995), Douglas Hofstadter (1999), and Stanley Mitchell (2008) have been used in this article. These are verse presentations. But there is another type of presentation – non-verse ones. V. Nabokov's translation, which is a rhythmic word-for-word translation (performed by using rhythmized prose), is one of them. C. Clarke's translation is also well-known, which is literally a prosaic version.

In addition to literary (interlingual) translations, a British-American film "Onegin" directed by Martha Fiennes, representing the adaptation of Pushkin's work (1999), was selected for the analysis. As it is known, the film received several prestigious awards, provoking completely different reactions in the English-speaking and Russian-speaking audiences, the analysis of which is presented below. This adaptation is interesting because it is a multiple translation of Pushkin's text: firstly, this is an English translation by V. Nabokov; secondly, an English-language verbal series of the film is based on the adaptation of Nabokov's translation to the cinema language; and thirdly, this is a verbal series of the Russian film version, which is a translation of the English-language cinema text. Moreover, this is not a "direct dub", but, to some extent, a new text aimed at the Russian-speaking audience expecting to hear Pushkin's language. Hence there is the use of familiar lines of the novel, major verse fragments, as well as techniques of historical and genre stylization. Thus, Pushkin's language has been transformed three times and such transformations are of a different nature – intralinguistic, interlingual and inter-semiotic.

A comparative linguoculturological and discursive analysis of Pushkin's original text and its English versions, literary and cinematographic ones, has been used for the conduct of this study. "Translation changes everything" – this is a title of L. Venuti's book. In this article, an attempt has been made to reveal what changes and how, when the most famous Russian text enters the English-speaking linguacultural space.

3. Results

The conducted research allowed drawing certain conclusions, which can be considered as its results. The main conclusions are as follows:

- Nowadays, the personality of A.S. Pushkin and his creativity occupy a rather prominent place in the English-speaking linguacultural space, as evidenced by various and quite numerous presentations of Pushkin's texts and biographical myth. These are primarily literary translations of his works and critical reviews about them, cinematographic interpretations of the poet's life and creativity, theatrical performances, scientific research, and primarily literary and various biographical sketches.
- From Pushkin's entire creative heritage, the verse novel "Eugene Onegin", the number of translations of which has been growing in recent decades, is one of the most famous texts for the English-speaking reader. Thus, it can be said that Pushkin's main text occupies an increasing space in English-language literature. As a rule, modern translators accompany their texts with a detailed translator's foreword and commentary, emphasizing, on the one hand, Pushkin's key role in Russian literature and, and trying, on the other hand, to disclose a unique historical-cultural layer of Pushkin's text to the English-speaking reader.

- The appearance of the English-American adaptation of "Onegin", which caused a significant resonance in the press and received several cinematic awards, is also an evidence of a rather high degree of familiarization and popularity of Pushkin's text.
- The evidence of a deeper penetration of Pushkin's novel into the English-speaking linguacultural space is its use as a prototype for new interpretations created by English-speaking authors.

A discussion of the ways, in which Pushkin's "Eugene Onegin" penetrates the linguistic culture of the Anglo-American world and how its space expands in this culture, is given below.

4. Discussion

4.1 Translatable/untranslatable Pushkin

It is well known that any text enters a new linguacultural space primarily through its translations. Here, we can talk about a degree of translatability/untranslatability of a certain author. The works of L.N. Tolstoy, F.M. Dostoyevsky and A.P. Chekhov are among the most famous texts of Russian classical writers outside Russia, while A.S. Pushkin's creativity is not so well known to the English-speaking reader. This also refers to the main work of the poet – a verse novel "Eugene Onegin", which occupies a very special place in Russian literature, culture, and society. A significant difference between Pushkin's place and role in Russian and world culture is noted by all critics, literary scholars, culturologists and translators of Pushkin's works.

E.N. Shapinskaya, a famous Russian culturologist writes as follows:

"Pushkin's status in Russian literature and culture as a whole is doubtless; his works have become the richest source of creation of cultural texts in the sphere of music and cinema. Pushkin's texts formed the basis of Chaikovsky's greatest operas – "Eugene Onegin" and "The Queen of Spades", M. Glinka's romances; filmmakers brought almost the whole Pushkin's prose to the screen. At the same time, Pushkin's works are not easily translated into foreign languages. For the Western world, Pushkin is more "different" than more famous prose writers, such as Dostoevsky or Chekhov. The choice of such work as "Eugene Onegin" presents a very difficult task for a foreign interpreter, primarily because of the poetic nature of the text, which became quotable for generations of Russian schoolchildren and split into quotations in Russian society a long time ago" (Shapinskaya, 2015).

Michael Johnson, a former AP foreign correspondent, writes the following:

"Say "Evgeny Onegin" to any educated Russian and you will trigger the first stanza or two of his great novel in verse. Some enthusiasts cannot be stopped for several more stanzas" (Johnson, 2013).

Indeed, many lines from "Eugene Onegin" have long acquired the status of quotable and precedent ones in the Russian textual space – they are remembered and constantly quoted, possessing powerful allusiveness. And Michael Johnson is absolutely right:

we remember the first stanza by heart, and there are quite a few "enthusiasts", who remember the whole novel or a lot of its fragments. Certainly, the most quotable fragment (which is well known to every Russian, regardless of age and social status) is the first stanza of Pushkin's text:

Moi dyadya samykh chestnykh pravil,

> *Kogda ne v shutku zanemog,*
>
> *On uvazhat sebya zastavil*
>
> *I luchshe vydumat ne mog.*
>
> *Ego primer drugim nauka* (Pushkin, 1982).

Many Russian readers know that this first line is an allusion to the line from I.A. Krylov's fable "Donkey and Peasant" – *"Osyol byl samykh chestnykh pravil"*. It seems that this remains hidden from the English-speaking reader unless he read V. Nabokov's commentary.

Table 2 shows the English versions of Pushkin's lines from the most famous English-language translations.

Table 2.

Versions of well-known translations of the fragment of A.S. Pushkin's "Eugene Onegin"				
Translation by Ch. Johnston	Translation by J. Falen	Translation by D. Hofstadter	Translation by S. Mitchell	Translation by V. Nabokov
My uncle — high ideals inspire him; but when past joking he fell sick, he really forced one to admire him — and never played a shrewder trick. Let others learn from his example! (Johnson, 1999)	My uncle, man of firm convictions . . . By falling gravely ill, he's won A due respect for his afflictions— The only clever thing he's done. May his example profit others; (Falen, 1995)	My uncle, matchless moral model, When deathly ill, learned how to make His friends respect him, bow and coddle — Of all his ploys, that takes the cake. To others, this might teach a lesson; (Hofstadter, 1999)	My uncle is a man of honour, When in good earnest he fell ill, He won respect by his demeanour And found the role he best could fill. Let others profit by his lesson (Mitchell, 2008)	My uncle has most honest principles: when taken ill in earnest, he has made one respect him and nothing better could invent. To others, his example is a lesson (Nabokov, 1990)

As is seen, in the above versions, the translators have tried to preserve Pushkin's rhyme AbAb. But, at the same time, not every translator has followed the alternation of female and male rhymes, while in Pushkin's stanza the rhyme scheme of the first four lines is based on the alternation of female (denoted by a capital letter) and male (denoted by a lowercase letter) rhymes. This alternation can be found in the translations of J. Falen and S. Mitchell. V. Nabokov's version, in which the translators have rejected the rhymed translation, and which are different from all other given examples.

It is unlikely that these English-language versions of Pushkin's lines have entered the minds of even educated Englishmen and Americans, as this happened with Shakespeare's texts, which have become integral parts of the Russian cultural fund and the background of "any educated Russian". It seems that few of the English-speaking readers remember even these first lines by heart, not to mention larger fragments. At the same time, a great many Russian-speaking readers

know and remember by heart the fragments from Shakespeare's texts, especially from "Hamlet" and sonnets. These texts have entered the Russian-language space and remained in the memory of Russian readers in various translated versions.

It seems unfair and even offensive that the favorite ones of Pushkin's lines (such as, for example, *We all learned a little/Something and somehow, So her name was Tatiana ...; Ah, those legs, where are you now? (My vse uchilis ponemnogu/Chemu-nibud i kak-nibud; Itak, zvalas ona Tatiyana...; Akh, nozhki, nozhki! Gde vy nynche?)* and many others), have stored in the memory of the most Russians, but remained alien to the Anglo-American readers. Charles Johnston, one of the translators of "Eugene Onegin", has given the reason for this situation. For example, speaking of Pushkin's untranslatability, he identifies a soundproof wall that separates the Russian poet from the English-speaking world: "Few foreign masterpieces can have suffered more than "*Eugene Onegin"* from the English translator's failure to convey anything more than – at best – the literal meaning. It is as if a **soundproof wall** separated Pushkin's poetic novel from the English-reading world. There is a whole magic which goes by default: the touching lyrical beauty, the cynical wit of the poem; the psychological insight, the devious narrative skill, the thrilling, compulsive grip of the novel; the tremendous gusto and swing and *panache* of the whole performance" (Johnston, 1977). It is easy to agree with the translator's opinion that in the translations Pushkin's magic is lost and, as noted by W. Winter, the author of the well-known work "Impossibilities of Translation", the translators are "doomed to fail" (Winter, 1961).

Thus, a paradoxical situation emerges: the first Russian poet could not join with the first poets of the West – Shakespeare, Dante, Petrarch, Goethe. It is necessary to quote the words of another translator of "Eugene Onegin" – James Falen, whose translation, like Johnston's one, is considered one of the best English versions of the novel. It should be noted that this translation, which, according to D. Hofstadter, is, in comparison with Johnston's translation, "smoother, more graceful and far clearer" can be heard in a well-known audio recording performed by S. Frai (Hofstadter, 1999). According to Falen,

> Alexander Pushkin is the poet and writer whom the **Russians regard as both the source and the summit of their literature.** Not only is he revered, like Shakespeare in the English tradition or Goethe in the German, as the supreme national poet, but **he has become a kind of cultural myth, an iconic figure around whom a veritable cult of idolatry has been fashioned.** This exalted status that Pushkin has been accorded in his own land has been something of a disservice to the living reality of his works, and **it contrasts oddly with the more modest reputation that Pushkin has secured abroad.** To many non-native readers of Russian literature the panegyrics of his compatriots seem excessive, and indeed, in their eyes, Pushkin has been somewhat overshadowed by the great Russian writers who came after him. They do not comprehend why these writers themselves generally grant him the first and highest place in their pantheon of artistic geniuses. For those who do not read Pushkin in his own language, the situation remains perplexing and the questions persist: **just who is he and why, almost without exception, do the most perceptive of his compatriots regard him as one of the world's greatest artists**? (Falen, 2009). (*Put in bold by us – N.N., Yu.P.*).

Thus, translation is an obvious reason why people do not know Pushkin and underestimate his genius. M. Johnson opines:

> "If Pushkin is less read outside Russia than Tolstoy, Dostoevsky or even Chekhov, this is mainly because of the problem of translation. I have never yet seen an adequate translation of any of his short lyrics, and even his prose demands a great deal of a translator" (Johnson,

2013).

In 1938 (one year after the widely and solemn celebration of a century after Pushkin's death in the Soviet Union) Ernest J. Simmons published an article "Russian Translations of Eugene Onegin" in the journal named "The Slavonic and East European Review". This article analyzed the first four English translations of "Eugene Onegin" done by T. Spolding (1988, London), Babette Deutsch (1936, New York), Dorothea Prall Radin and George Z. Patrick (1937, Berkeley), Oliver Elton (1937, London). The author here also emphasized the "untranslatability" of Pushkin's poetry noting that many great poetic works remain great in translation, but this has not happened to Pushkin:

> "... no foreign poet with anything like Pushkin's ability, or with a mastery of the Russian Language and a command of the special technique of the consummate translator has appeared to do full justice to his works" (Simmons, 1938).

Speaking about the difficulties faced by a translator of Pushkin's poetry, E. Simmons writes:

> "It is not necessary to itemize here the many difficulties, which a translator of Pushkin has to face; they have been described on various occasions. The question is not one merely of form, of metre, rhyme, and the mechanical ordering of lines. The form of some poets is easy to duplicate. But Pushkin's form is never a kind of a dress or a shell; it is the very soul of his poetic expression, a quintessential quality which Russian critics have described as "Pushkin's language". He handles the Russian language, in words of Maurice Baring, "as a great orchestrator writes an orchestral score". And his phrase-making, his delicate word-selection, and the finer nuances of his verse harmony have never been successfully imitated, even by his Russian followers in poetry. Pushkin's language is as unique, in a sense, as Shakespeare's language" (Simmons, 1938).

The comparison of Pushkin's place in Russian literature and culture with Shakespeare's place in the English-speaking world is rather common, but Western critics, writers, and translators usually note that while Shakespeare's works can be easily translated into other languages, Pushkin's poetry loses almost everything in translation because his poetry is simply inseparable from the power of the Russian language. It is appropriate here to recall the words of E. Sapir who, arguing about the translatability/untranslatability of the literary text, pointed to the existence of two different types or levels of art: one of them is "generalizing, extralinguistic art, which can be expressed through the means of another language without detriment", and the second one is "specifically linguistic art, which is essentially untranslatable". He went on to explain:

> "Literature moves in language as a medium, but that medium comprises of two layers: the latent content of language – our intuitive record of experience, and the particular conformation of a given language – the specific <how> of our record of experience. Literature that draws its sustenance mainly (never entirely) from the lower layer, say a play of Shakespeare's, is translatable without too great a loss of character. If literature moves in the upper rather than in the lower level – a fair example is a lyric of Swinburne's – it is as good as untranslatable" (Sapir, 2001)

If we follow such a division of literature, apparently, it must be recognized that Pushkin's poetic texts refer to "specifically linguistic art" and remain untranslatable, and, therefore, they are less read in the English-speaking world.

However, Pushkin's "untranslatability" and "unreadability" do not reduce the desire of translators to translate his works, and, certainly, first and foremost, new attempts are made to

translate "Eugene Onegin".

4.2. From the history of translations of "Eugene Onegin"

The history of translations of "Eugene Onegin" into English began in 1881, when Henry Spalding's translation was published in London. Since then, an English version of "Onegin" is constantly supplemented with new versions. Here are the main of them:

1963. Translation by Walter Arndt. The translation is famous for the fact that it preserves the rhythm and "Onegin stanza". The translator was awarded the Bellingen *Prize.*

1964. Translation by Vladimir Nabokov. It is radically different from all other translations and significantly influenced the work of the next generation of translators. It will be discussed below.

1977. Translation by Sir Charles Johnston. It, as already mentioned, is still considered one of the best English versions of Pushkin's text.

1990. Translation by James E. Falen. As this translation is one of the most common in the English-speaking audience, as it is easily read. As already mentioned, it was used for the audio book. In addition, Falen managed to preserve the structure of *Onegin*'s stanzas and the melodic nature of Pushkin's text.

1999. Translation by Douglas Hofstadter. He presented an American version of "Onegin", which is distinguished by its modernity and spoken language.

2008. Translation by Stanley Mitchell, which is by far one of the most popular in the world.

These translations consist only a very small part of the English versions of Pushkin's original text, which are available for reading today. A full (or almost complete) list of translations can be found at https://www.york.ac.uk/depts/maths/histstat/pml1/onegin/ "English Versions of Pushkin's *Eugene Onegin*". The list on this site includes 45 translations. But none of them can claim the congeniality of Pushkin's text, in which the highest poetry is combined with the "encyclopedia of Russian life", according to V.G. Belinsky, and which genre was called by Pushkin as "a verse novel". How can verse, novel and encyclopedic components be expressed at the same time? It is impossible to express everything and a translator has to make a choice: what should be sacrificed? It is appropriate to recall the words of the Russian outstanding translator M. Lozinsky, who said that translation is "an art of losses". In poetic translation, this art becomes particularly difficult. In search of an answer to the question of what "can/cannot" be lost in translation, two different translation strategies known as *domestication* and *foreignization*, in contemporary translation studies, have been formed. Below, we will consider the way these strategies were implemented in the translations of Pushkin's text.

4.3. Domestication and foreignization in the English translations of "Eugene Onegin"

According to the tradition that has developed in poetic translation, there are two opposite methods of translating a poetic text: translating verses in verse and translating poetry by prose. K.I. Chukovsky noted the choice of one of these methods, when he wrote about the possibility (or rather, impossibility) of translating Pushkin's text. He thought that every translator, who takes on the task of translating "Eugene Onegin", can "either be satisfied with the exact reproduction of the plot and completely forget about the artistic form, or create an imitation of the form and fill this imitation with scraps of meaning, convincing him/herself and readers that such distortion of meaning for the sake of mellifluence of rhymes gives a translator the opportunity to express the "spirit" more precisely" (Chukovsky, 1988). Most translators try to create the "imitation of the form"

(to translate "verses in verse"), while many other translators try to recreate *Onegin*'s stanza.

But there is another stratum of translations – a prosaic one, the goal of which is to acquaint the readers with the substantive component of Pushkin's work. Two types of translations can be distinguished in the mentioned one. The translation by V. Nabokov is one of them. The second one belongs to R. Clarke (2005). In both the cases, we can talk about the so-called *genre switching*; however, the goals of translators are different. The scheme of the above mentioned translations are the implementation of different strategies of foreignization (Nabokov) and domestication (Clarke). Clarke, as he wrote in his foreword to the translation, sought to translate the brilliant poetic text only as a novel with a fascinating plot, changing the genre and the form. This is not only prosaic paraphrasing but also the simplification of the text, which has been explained by the author of the translation by a desire to make Pushkin "accessible", precisely, for the general English-speaking reader. This is why almost all references and allusions have been removed from the translation (while Nabokov necessarily preserves and explains them), and according to Clarke that they may be incomprehensible to the readers. The names of divinities, which are so many in Pushkin's text, also disappear. In our opinion, this is a method of translation in which a translator, according to Fr. Schleiermacher, "leaves the reader alone as much as possible and moves the writer toward the reader" (Schleiermacher, 1992, p. 42). Reading Clarke's translation, we see how much he "cares" for the reader, removing all (in his understanding) the "dark spots" of Pushkin's text. He writes:

> "I have 'demythologized' the prose by avoiding references to particular deities. Where the mythological names stand for simple nouns, I have used the latter" (Clarke, 2005).

For example, Pushkin's Diana, Flora, and Terpsichore disappear from the translation and girls/ladies replace them. In Table 3 below, there is a relevant fragment of the novel and its translation by Clarke.

Table 3.

An example of translation of a fragment of A.S. Pushkin's novel "Eugene Onegin"	
A fragment of A.S. Pushkin's novel "Eugene Onegin"	Fragment translation by Clarke
Diany grud, lanity Flory Prelestny, milye druzya! Odnako nozhka Terpsikhory Prelestnei chem-to dlya menya (Pushkin, 1982)	My dear friends, the glimpse of a girl's bare breasts or her blossoming cheeks is delightful, I know; but the dainty foot of a lass as she dances is for me somehow more delightful still (Clarke, 2005)

The translator constantly uses this kind of linguacultural adaptation, removing all, in his opinion, "obscure" references to Pushkin's contemporary literature, mythology, theater, etc. In general, the analysis of the English version proposed by R. Clarke allows regarding it more likely as retelling than translation, and retelling for the "unenlightened" reader. Undoubtedly, this translation can be called *domestication of the original text*.

A different picture can be seen when we turn to V. Nabokov's translation. On the contrary, he "leaves the writer alone as much as possible and moves the reader towards the writer" (Schleiermacher, 1992). In other words, he creates what H. Gasset called "a cumbersome device" for the translation's familiarization with the original. This "device" includes almost literal word-for-word translation and an extensive detailed commentary. A translator Nabokov strives to provide his reader (a speaker of a different language and a bearer of different culture) with the opportunity, on

the one hand, to see how the original text is made (literal word-for-word translation) and, on the other hand, to show the entire vertical context of Pushkin's text (commentary). This translation does not claim to be perceived as original. After Gasset, this translation can be defined as the "way" to Pushkin and his text. Such translation is certainly made for the "good reader" (as was imagined by Nabokov) rather than for the general reader.

Nabokov called this translation "honest". This is the translation where English and Russian words become "doubles". The beginning of the last eighth chapter given in Table 4 below may be taken as an example.

Table 4.

An example of translation of a fragment of A.S. Pushkin's novel "Eugene Onegin"	
A fragment of A.S. Pushkin's novel "Eugene Onegin"	A fragment translated by Nabokov
V te dni, kogda v sadakh Litseya	In those days when in the Lyceum's garden
Ia bezmyatezhno rastsvetal,	I bloomed serenely
Chital okhotno Apuleya,	would eagerly read Apuleius
A Tsitserona ne chital,	while Cicero I did not read
V te dni, v tainstvennykh dolinakh,	in those days, in mysterious valleys
Vesnoi, pri klikakh lebedinykh,	in springtime, to the calls of swans
Bliz vod, siyavshikh v tishine,	near waters radiant in the stillness,
Yavlyatsya Muza stala mne. (Pushkin, 1982)	to me the Muse began appearing (Nabokov, 1990)

A more precise word-for-word translation is hard to imagine: every Pushkin's word finds its expression in the English version of the text. This is actually "honest translation", to which Nabokov aspired. English and Russian words become doubles, which allow, as noted by Brian Boyd, seeing Pushkin's world beyond the English word (though not always correct). The intentional inaccuracy of English constructions and the unusual nature of many words make Nabokov's text "alien" to the English-speaking reader, but this is what the translator strives for: as already said, he does not seek to replace Pushkin's text, rather he creates a meta-text that allows seeing from what and how the original text is constructed. In this case, apparently, one can say that the writer creates a special translation toolkit. This translation brought an almost scandalous fame to Nabokov, the majority of critics called him "unreadable". However, Boyd, noting some clumsiness of Nabokov's translation, distortions of the English language in it, had to admit that in the verse translations of the novel "English is no more acceptable than Nabokov's – although, for other reasons – and, at the same time, infinitely less close to Pushkin's text" (Boyd, 2004).

As is known, Nabokov was not only a translator but also a theorist, who substantiated his concept of translation. In addition to the commentary on "Eugene Onegin", which can rightly be called "an armchair feat", he wrote articles on the problems of his translation. "Servile Path" is one of them, where the translator's credo is already expressed in the title. Another one is "Problems of Translation: *Onegin* in English". In this translator's "manifest", Nabokov categorically states that "the clumsiest literal translation is a thousand times more useful than the prettiest paraphrase" (Nabokov, 2003). The fact that the literal translation is clumsy and difficult to read is recognized again. The traditional compliment to the author of the translation – "it reads smoothly" – is not a

compliment for Nabokov. He is convinced that "one should abandon the common opinion once and for all as if the translation "should read smoothly" and "should not make an impression of translation". For that matter, any translation, which does not make an impression of translation, will certainly turn out to be inaccurate on closer examination". The writer calls the literal translation "honest" (compare with the opinion of Chukovsky, who considers it "the most false").

Before going to translate the ingenious Pushkin's text, Nabokov analyzed the available translations of "Eugene Onegin" (he called them mistranslated) into English, German, French and comes to the following important conclusions:

> 1. It is impossible to translate "Onegin" in rhyme. 2. It is possible to describe in a series of footnotes the modulations and rhymes of the text as well as all its associations and other special features. 3. It is possible to translate "Onegin" with a reasonable accuracy by substituting for fourteen rhymed tetrameter lines of each stanza with fourteen unrhymed lines of varying length, from iambic dimeter to iambic pentameter (Venuti, 2003).

The translation, which Nabokov needed, should be filled with a lot of footnotes:

> I want translations with copious footnotes, footnotes reaching up like skyscrapers to the top of this or that page so as to leave only the gleam of one textual line between commentary and eternity. I want such footnotes and absolutely literal sense, with no emasculation and no padding (Venuti, 2003).

As can be seen from the above fragment, footnotes and an absolutely literal meaning without any "depletion" and without any "addition" are the main things for Nabokov-translator. He finished this emotional passage about the way his translation should be by the following words: "And when my Onegin is ready, it will either conform exactly to my vision or not appear at all" (Venuti, 2003). Knowing how Nabokov appreciated his translation of "Onegin", we can assume that the latter fully corresponded to his vision of translation. Perhaps, Nabokov tried to create a kind of canonical translation. Anyway, the translators, who referred to "Eugene Onegin" after Nabokov, could not ignore his translation. Speaking of the difficulties of translation of Pushkin's work, Charles Johnston notes as follows:

> "it should be possible now, with the help of Nabokov's literal translation and commentary, to produce a reasonably accurate rhyming version of Pushkin's work which can at least be read with pleasure and entertainment, and which, ideally, might even be able to stand on its own feet as English" (Johnson, 1977).

From all the translations of "Eugene Onegin", despite all the criticism that struck Nabokov, his translation has become a kind of *Onegin*'s encyclopedia for English-speaking readers (including translators), who want to understand Pushkin's text. It also formed the basis of a verbal series of the film "Onegin" by Marta Fiennes, which will be analyzed below.

4.4. Translation of "Eugene Onegin" into the cinema language

The analysis of the available translations of "Eugene Onegin" shows that it is unlikely that the great Russian text will fit in with English-speaking linguaculture, as Shakespeare fit in with Russian culture. It is most likely that the situation will remain the same as presented by D. Hofstadter, who wrote the following in the foreword to his translation:

> "When, sometime in my dim past, I first heard the "Eugene Onegin", it was as the title of a Tchaikovsky opera. The name "Alexander Pushkin" was nowhere in sight, nor was the idea of poetry. And in recent years I have found, over and over again, that my experience is pretty

typical, outside of Russia" (Hofstadter, 1999)

Nevertheless, translators, writers, literary critics, composers, opera and ballet directors and filmmakers do not give up their attempts to introduce the work into the English-speaking linguacultural space, as evidenced by the appearance of a book "My Talisman: the Poetry and Life of Alexander Pushkin" written by J. Lowenfeld, a researcher of the life and creativity of A.S. Pushkin and a translator of his works, a documentary film by an American director M. Bekelhaymer "Pushkin is Our Everything", an Anglo-American feature film "Onegin" that received numerous cinematographic awards and caused resonance in foreign and Russian press, as well as the production of "Boris Godunov" performed by the Royal Shakespeare Company, new productions of Pushkin's works on the stages of European opera and ballet theatres, and, finally, creation by English-speaking writers of works based on the novel "Eugene Onegin", in particular such verse novels as "Golden Gate" by V. Seth and "Richard Burgin. A Life in verse" by D. Burgin.

The same-name opera of the Russian composer P.I. Chaikovsky was probably the most successful attempt to introduce the English-speaking audience to "Eugene Onegin", which was confirmed both by the above words of D. Hofstadter and statistics, according to which the opera "Eugene Onegin" took 17th place among the most performed operas in Europe (247 productions) and the most popular Russian opera in Europe (World Opera Statistics. Retrieved September, 2017).

In our opinion, another equally successful attempt to introduce the novel "Eugene Onegin" to the English-speaking linguacultural space was a British-American film adaptation of "Eugene Onegin" in 1999, which received the prize for Best Director at the Tokyo Film Festival (Marta Fiennes), the Golden Aries in the nomination for the "Best Female Role in a Foreign Film" from the Russian Guild of Film Critics (Liv Tyler), the Alexander Korda Award for the outstanding British Film of the Year of the British Academy of Film and Television Arts, the London Film Critics' Circle Award for Best Debut (Martha Fiennes). Despite many awards, the public took the film quite ambiguously.

As cinematography is a popular art form, a filmmaker, as a rule, has to adapt a work of art based on interests, values, and the level of readiness of the gross audience; however, he/she can influence the broad audience and thereby form popular culture. Obviously, the creators of the film sought to acquaint the English-speaking audience with the great Russian work, while adapting it to contemporary English-speaking culture, transforming the text of the novel's translation to a large extent.

We consider the screen adaptation of a work of art as a kind of intersemiotic translation or transmutation in terms of R. Jacobson. Transmutation means translation of a work of art from one semiotic system, for example, from a system of verbal signs, into any other semiotic system using both verbal and non-verbal codes (Jacobson, 1978). It should also be noted that an intersemiotic translation of the literary text in the form of its screen adaptation is often accompanied by an interlingual translation since it is conducted not directly from an original text, but from a secondary text, which can be represented by interlingual translations. Thus, film screening, which is a screen adaptation of the work written in a foreign language, in another linguacultural community, which is accompanied by titles in the translated language or by dubbing (Rarenko, 2014).

We have analyzed the way a verbal code of Pushkin's work is transformed in the process of its intersemiotic and interlingual translation. In particular, in the course of its analysis, we have compared four texts: the verbal text used in the English film version, its translation into Russian,

the text of the screened novel by A.S. Pushkin in the Russian film version, as well as Nabokov's translation of the novel into English, which formed the basis of the film. We have compared, firstly, the verbal text used in the English film version with Nabokov's translation of Pushkin's novel, secondly, the text of the English film version with the translation of the film into Russian, thirdly, the text of the Russian film version with the text of A.S. Pushkin's novel. As the analysis has shown, a verbal series undergoes multiple transformations in translation. It can be said that, in this case, this is not one linguacultural adaptation nor one translation.

The first stage of our analysis has implied the comparison of the first couple of texts: the text of Pushkin's novel in Nabokov's translation into English and the relevant text used in the English film version.

According to the filmmakers that they chose Nabokov's translation because of its accuracy and details (Interview with Martha and Ralph Fiennes, 1999). However, if Nabokov aspired to the most accurate translation of Pushkin's work, the filmmakers largely retreated from Nabokov's translation. According to the film director M. Fiennes that the transfer of the work to a different discourse (film discourse) is one of the reasons (Interview with Martha and Ralph Fiennes, 1999). As it is known, the transformation of a work of art as a result of its screen adaptation is inevitable, since the film discourse imposes certain restrictions on the literary work and, at the same time, provides new audiovisual possibilities for the transfer of the information expressed verbally in the text of the literary work.

In particular, the filmmakers omitted many details like Onegin's childhood and adolescence, Lensky's life abroad, Tatyana's dream, and other episodes were not described in the film. The sequence of some scenes and events was changed: thus, the conversation between Onegin and Tatyana took place on her name-day, but not before; the text of Tatyana's letter to Onegin sounded only at the end of the film. There were neither lyrical digressions of the author of the novel nor an image of the author.

Another reason for the transformation of Nabokov's text in the course of its screen adaptation is a change in the target audience. Obviously, the filmmakers focused on the modern English-speaking gross audience. In this regard, simple, laconic dialogues of the main characters were constructed in accordance with the standards of modern English, and the writers tried to avoid both too formal and too colloquial vocabulary.

The film contains additional scenes and dialogues filled with realistic details, which cannot be found in the text of the novel. For example, in the film, the will executor of Onegin's uncle reads his will which contains the detailed description of all the property inherited by Onegin. In the scene of the duel, Lensky's second explains to Onegin the rules of the duel, etc.

The filmmakers also rethink the dialogues of the main characters developing the author's meanings embedded in them. For example, while Pushkin's Tatyana humbly listens to Onegin's lesson and does not say a word, in the film, Tatyana argues with Onegin and tells him that "he cursed himself" (English Subtitles for the movie "Onegin", 1999).

Table 5 contains several examples from the dialogues of the main characters.

Table 5.

Comparative table with fragments of A.S. Pushkin's novel "Eugene Onegin",

its translation performed by V. Nabokov, and verbal texts of English and Russian versions of the film "Eugene Onegin"

A fragment of A.S. Pushkin's novel "Eugene Onegin"	A fragment of V. Nabokov's translation	A fragment of the English film version	A fragment of the Russian film version
No, bozhe moi, kakaya skuka S bolnym sidet i den i noch, Ne otkhodya ni shagu proch! Kakoe nizkoe kovarstvo **Poluzhivogo** zabavlyat, **Yemu podushki popravlyat,** Pechalno podnosit lekarstvo, **Vzdykhat i dumat pro sebya:** **Kogda zhe chort vozmyot tebya!** (Pushkin, 1982)	but, **good God**, what a bore to sit by a **sick** person day and night, not stirring a step away! What base perfidiousness to entertain one half-alive, **adjust for him his pillows,** sadly serve him his medicine, **sigh – and think inwardly** when *will* the devil take **you?** (Nabokov, 1990)	Summoned to the **sick** bed. **Oh, God.** The dying platitudes of the **half-dead**. **Arranging the pillows**… the stench. **All the time thinking…** **When will the Devil take him?** <u>**When will the Devil come for me?**</u> <u>**When will the Devil take me?***</u>	Vot nakazaniye, **o Bozhe,** sidet u smertnogo odra… Slushat bormotanie **poluzhivogo** startsa… **Popravlyat emu podushki…** Mrak. **I vse vremya dumat:** **Kogda zhe chort ego vozmet?** <u>**A kogda on pridet za mnoi?**</u> <u>**Kogda chort vozmet menya?****</u>
- Ya vybral by druguyu, **Kogda b ya byl, kak ty, poet.** **V chertakh u Olgi zhizni net.** Toch-v-toch v Vandikovoi Madonne: **Krugla, krasna litsom ona,** **Kak eta glupaya luna** **Na etom glupom nebosklone.** (Pushkin, 1982)	**I'd have the other, had I been like you a poet.** **In Olga's features, there's no life,** just as in a Vandyke Madonna: she's **round** and fair of face as is that **silly** moon up in that **silly** sky (Nabokov, 1990)	**If I'd been a poet, like you,** **I think I'd have chosen** **Tatyana rather than Olga.** What's wrong with Olga? Nothing. She's… perfectly… - <u>**Perfectly** what?</u> - <u>**Perfectly perfect***</u>	**Bud ya poetom, to vybral by Tatyanu, a ne Olgu.** Chto ne tak v Olge? Nichego. Ona sovershenno… <u>-**Sovershenno** chto?</u> <u>-**Sovershennoe sovershenstvo****.**</u>

Note: * – hereinafter a quote from the website (English Subtitles for the Movie "Onegin", 1999)

** – hereinafter a quote from the website (Russian Subtitles for the Movie "Onegin", 1999)

The main characters of the film express their feelings more openly and boldly, as if they are contemporaries of the audience, and instead of Pushkin's lines: *"I love you (why should I lie?), but I am another man's wife; I will be faithful to him forever"* we hear from the screen:

Tatyana: You told me once that my heart would heal. So will yours, Evgeny.

Onegin: And has it healed? Has your heart healed?

Tatyana: Oh, God! It hurts! It hurts!

Onegin: Why? Why does it hurt? Why? Tell me.

Tatyana: Because you are too late.

Onegin: Save me.

Tatyana: I cannot save you.

Onegin: You have to save me.

Tatyana: I cannot.

Onegin: Tell me that you love me. Please tell me. Lie to me.

Tatyana: I love you. I do. I am another man's wife, do you understand? And I have given him my word. And I will be faithful to him. I will (Russian Subtitles for the Movie "Onegin", 1999).

The analysis of the texts of Onegin and Tatyana's letters requires particular attention. The letters of the main characters in the film present the brief retelling of the corresponding fragments of V. Nabokov's translation. Having omitted some details, film scriptwriters simultaneously retained the structure and main components of the content of letters, mainly using the words found in V. Nabokov's translation or their synonyms, while the syntactic structures were simplified. The examples are given in Table 6 below.

Table 6.

A comparative table of fragments of letters of the main characters from Nabokov's translation of "Eugene Onegin" and from the script of the film "Eugene Onegin" directed by M. Fiennes	
Fragments of the text of V. Nabokov's translation	Fragments of the text of the film script
I **know**, within your will to **punish** me with scorn (Nabokov, 1990)	I know it is in your power to **punish** my presuming heart**.
But you, preserving for **my hapless** lot at least **one drop of pity**, **you'll not abandon me** (Nabokov, 1990)	Yet if you have **one drop of pity,** **you'll not abandon me** to **my unhappy** fate.**
if I had had the hope but seldom, but **once a week**, to **see you** at our country place, only to hear you speak, to say **a word** to you, and then to **think and think about one thing**, both **day and night**, **till** a new **meeting**. **But, they say, you're unsociable**; **in backwoods**, in **the country**, all **bores you**... (Nabokov, 1990)	I'd never have revealed my shame to you, if just **once a week** I might **see you**, exchange a **word** or two, and then **think day and night of one thing** alone **till** our next **meeting**. **But you're unsociable, they say**. The country **bores you**.**
Why did you **visit us**? In the backwoods of a forgotten village, **I would have never known** you	Sometimes I wonder that you ever **visited us**. Why? **I'd never have known you** or known this

nor have known this bitter torment (Nabokov, 1990)	agony and fever.**
Resolve my doubts. **Perhaps, 'tis nonsense all,** an inexperienced soul's **delusion**, and there's something **quite** different. . . . Destined (Nabokov, 1990)	**Resolve my doubts**. **Perhaps this is all nonsense**, emptiness, **a delusion**, and **quite** another fate awaits me.**

Note: ** – hereinafter a quote from the website (English Subtitles for the Movie "Onegin", 1999)

Thus, the filmmakers treated Nabokov's translation quite freely, interpreting the material in their own way. These changes in the text in the course of its screen adaptation, as already mentioned, are due both to the laws of cinema and filmmakers' desire to bring together the characters of the film and contemporary audience. The film director M. Fiennes was interested primarily in the inner world of the characters and the universality of love in time and space.

According to E.N. Shapinskaya, an author of the article "'Eugene Onegin' in the Eyes of the Other: the British Interpretation in Cinema and on Opera Stage", "This is symptomatic of the modern view on the classical heritage, which is attractive not for its "otherness", but for its universal values, which is due to the loss of the authenticity of ethno-cultural communities in our pluralistic world of countless "others"" (Shapinskaya, 2015).

The next stage of the analysis implies the comparison between the texts used in English and Russian film versions. The analysis showed that the translation was made close to the text except for the letters of the main characters, at the translation of which the fragments of Pushkin's verse novel were used.

It should be specially noted that while translating the film text the translators used a technique of historical stylization; in particular, the film text was translated into modern Russian; while in order to recreate the color of Pushkin's epoch, stylistically marked vocabulary was included in the translation in a much larger volume than it was in the film text in English. The translators archaized many neutral phrases in English and often included culturally marked vocabulary in the text. The examples are given in Table 7.

Table 7.

Examples of using a technique of historical stylization when translating the film "Eugene Onegin" directed by Fiennes	
Fragments of the verbal text of the film in English	Fragments of the verbal text of the film in Russian
Should they meet with your approval, **sign this**.*	Ya ostavlyayu Vam bumagi. Esli vozrazhenii net, **soizvolte postavit svoyu podpis**.**
Some landowners **came to see** you while you were out.*	Bez Vas **izvolili priezzhat** gospoda s vizitom.**
- This is the book she borrowed? - **Yes**.*	- Etu knigu ona brala? - **Da, barin.** **
No, **can't say** I've heard of it.*	Net, **ne imel chesti** slyshat. **

No, I propose to **rent** it.*	Net. Ya **barshchinu** zamenyayu na **obrok.** **
This country has no need of political experiments.*	**Matushke-Rossii** ne nuzhny Vashi politicheskie eksperimenty. **
Where's your second, for God's sake?*	**Sudar,** gde Vash sekundant?**

Note: * – hereinafter a quote from the website (English Subtitles for the Movie "Onegin", 1999)

** – hereinafter a quote from the website (Russian Subtitles for the Movie "Onegin", 1999)

We also assume that the translators of the film text tried to imitate the style of Pushkin's novel. In particular, a phrase "Age has withered her. And wither my desire" was translated by using the iambic tetrameter, a meter used in writing the verse novel: "*Goda ee ne poshchadili, i vot moi interes ugas*" (English Subtitles for the Movie "Onegin", 1999; Russian Subtitles for the Movie "Onegin", 1999; Pushkin, 1982).

Finally, as noted above, the translators used poetic fragments of the original text of the novel, which was well-known to the Russian-speaking audience. The examples are given in Table 8.

Table 8.

A comparative table with the fragments of V. Nabokov's translation of "Eugene Onegin", as well as of the verbal texts of English and Russian versions of the film "Eugene Onegin"		
Fragments of V. Nabokov's translation	Fragments of the verbal text of the English film version	Fragments of the verbal text of the Russian film version
Resolve my doubts. Perhaps, 'tis nonsense all, an inexperienced soul's delusion, and there's something quite different ...destined (Nabokov, 1990)	**Help me**. Resolve my doubts. Perhaps this is all nonsense, **emptiness, a delusion,** **and quite another fate awaits me**.*	Moi somnenya razreshi. Byt mozhet, eto vse pustoe, obman Neopytnoi dushi! I suzhdeno sovsem inoe...**
But you, preserving for my hapless lot at least one drop of pity, you'll not abandon me. At first, I wanted to be silent; believe me: of my shame you never would have known if I had had the hope but seldom, but once a week, to see you at our country place, only to hear you speak, to say a word to you, and then to think and think about one	**Yet if you have one drop of pity,** you'll not abandon me **to my unhappy fate.** **I am in love with you, and I must tell you this or my heart... my heart which belongs to you, will surely break. I'd never have revealed my shame to you, if just once a week I might see you, exchange a word or two**, and then think day and night of one thing **alone** till our **next meeting**.*	No vy, k moei neschastnoi dole Khot kaplyu zhalosti khranya, Vy ne ostavite menya. Snachala ya molchat khotela; Poverte: moego styda Vy ne uznali by nikogda, Kogda by nadezhdu ya imela Khot redko, khot v nedelyu raz V derevne nashei videt vas, Chtob tolko slyshat vashi rechi, Vam slovo molvit, i potom Vse dumat, dumat ob odnom I den, i noch do novoi vstrechi.**

thing, both day and night, till a new meeting (Nabokov, 1990)		

Note: * – hereinafter a quote from the website (English Subtitles for the Movie "Onegin", 1999)

** – hereinafter a quote from the website (Russian Subtitles for the Movie "Onegin", 1999)

Thus, as we can see, the translators of the film used a strategy of domestication of the text, trying to bring the film text to the original text of Pushkin's novel as close as possible.

It is interesting to analyze the reviews of English-speaking and Russian-speaking film viewers. The English-speaking audience has only a general idea of Russian culture and knows little about A.S. Pushkin's work; therefore, it judges the film as an independent work (English-Speaking Viewers' Reviews of the Movie "Onegin", n.d.). This explains the difference in the ratings given to the film by Russian-speaking and English-speaking viewers. Most English-speaking viewers spoke about the film rather positively. Only a few foreign viewers, who read the novel in the original or saw the adaptation of the same-name opera by P. Tchaikovsky, noted that its screen adaptation was much inferior to the original source. They also pointed out the differences between Russian and English cultures and the impossibility of recreating the spirit of the novel by Anglo-American filmmakers; nevertheless, this does not belittle the merits of the film as an independent work (English-Speaking Viewers' Reviews of the Movie "Onegin", n.d.).

The opinion of Russian-speaking film viewers, who are familiar with A.S. Pushkin's novel, has been divided into two diametrically opposite opinions. Some call the screen adaptation of the novel "one continuous disappointment", others – "outstanding work" (Russian Viewers' Reviews of the Movie "Onegin", n.d.). G.M. Ibatullina assesses the film positively in her article "Onegin" as an "encyclopedia of the Russian soul": from the first cadres, we feel that the film images are images of Russian consciousness and culture, as they are seen from the outside. It becomes clear that the figurative-semantic space of the film is a deeply dialogized, reflexively constructed space, which requires of the viewer an ability to be a full-fledged participant in such a dialogue and not remain within the framework of his/her own myths and attitudes. What may seem to be "a la russe" stamps is actually deeply reflected by the codes of perception of the Russian world from the outside, and each such "stamp" in the dialogic poetics of the film is aesthetically flawless: the authors do not clone cliché images mechanically, but fill them with the living meaning; in fact, each such image begins to function as an "archetype of perception" (Ibatullina, 2015).

Conclusion

Research results make it possible to assert that the place of Pushkin and his novel "Eugene Onegin" in the English-speaking space is becoming more and more significant. Currently, there is a rather active process of introducing the first Russian poet and his main creation into the English-speaking world and this happens in different ways: nowadays, beside the opera "Eugene Onegin" performed on world stages, there are two ballets (G. Krenko's ballet "Onegin" and G. Neumeier's ballet "Tatyana"), a musical of the theater company "Makers Lab" "Onegin's Demon", a musical of the theatrical company "The Musical Stage Company" "Onegin". The fact that a homonym "Onegin" is becoming more and more popular in Anglo-American culture is evidenced by numerous responses of the viewers, who watched the same-name film.

Certainly, it is probably too early to say that Pushkin's place in the English-speaking linguacultural space has become as noticeable as the place of L.N. Tolstoy, F.M. Dostoevsky, and

A.P. Chekhov; however, a degree of its popularity and recognition is getting higher and higher. It should also be emphasized that many English translators, literary scholars, and critics consider Pushkin's role in Russian literature and Shakespeare's role in the English-speaking world to be comparable. And although Pushkin's field in English-speaking culture is not as pronounced as Shakespeare's field in Russian, the conducted analysis of English presentations of "Eugene Onegin" allows us to say that Pushkin's verse novel acquires a status of a "powerful text" and becomes a center of the emerging field of intertextual interpretations.

Prospects for further research include the in-depth study of the processes of the formation of Pushkin's field in the English-speaking cultural space, including the intertextual analysis of the emerging meta-texts of various semiotic systems, since according to U. Eco, "... a certain semiotic system can say less or more than the other semiotic system, but one cannot say that both of them can express the same things" (Eco, 2006).

References:

Boyd, B. (1998). *Vladimir Nabokov: amerikanskie gody* [Vladimir Nabokov. The American Years]. Moscow: Nezavisimaya gazeta; St. Petersburg: Simpozium. (p. 984).

Chukovsky, K. (1988). *Onegin na chuzhbine. Vysokoe iskusstvo. O printsipakh khudozhestvennogo perevoda* [Onegin in a Far-Off Land. High Art. On the Principles of Literary Translation] (pp. 324-344). Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel.

Eco, U. (2008). *Saying Almost the Same Thing. Experiences in Translation* (A. McEwen, Trans.). University of Toronto Press. (p. 146).

English Subtitles for the Movie "Onegin". (1999). Retrieved September 28, 2017, from http://subsmax.com/subtitles-movie/onegin-1999

English Versions of Pushkin's Eugene Onegin. (n.d.). Retrieved September 1, 2017, from https://www.york.ac.uk/depts/maths/histstat/pml1/onegin/

English Viewers' Reviews of the Movie "Onegin". (n.d.). Retrieved September 1, 2017, from www.amazon.co.uk

Evans, J. (2002). *Pushkin's Children*. Retrieved September 1, 2017, from https://www.theguardian.com/books/2002/aug/17/featuresreviews.guardianreview4

Ibatullina, G.M. (2015). "Onegin" kak "entsiklopedia russkoi dushi", ili Pushkin iz "zazerkalya" ["Onegin" as an "Encyclopedia of the Russian Soul", or Pushkin "through the Looking Glass"]. *Filologicheskii klass, 4*(42), 12-18.

Interview with Martha and Ralph Fiennes. (1999). Retrieved September 1, 2017, from http://home.the-wire.com/~steph/rfrr/rflatimes.html

Jacobson, R. (1978). O lingvisticheskikh aspektakh perevoda [On Linguistic Aspects of Translation]. In *Voprosy teorii perevoda v zarubezhnoi lingvistike* [Issues of the Translation Theory in Foreign Linguistics] (pp. 16-25). Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya.

Johnson, M. (2013). *Tea with the Pushkins in Brussels*. Retrieved September 1, 2017, from (https://www.openlettersmonthly.com/tea-with-the-pushkins-in-brussels/)

Lotman, Yu.M. (1988). *V shkole slova: Pushkin, Lermontov, Gogol* [In the School of Word: Pushkin, Lermontov, Gogol]. Moscow: Prosveshcheniye. (p. 352).

Nabokov, V. (2004). Problems of Translation: "Onegin" in English. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 71-83). Routledge.

Pushkin, A.S. (1982). *Sochineniya* [Works] (Vol. 2, p. 35). Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura.

Pushkin, A. (2005). *Eugene Onegin and Four Tales from Russia's Southern Frontier* (R. Clarke, Trans.). Wordsworth Classics of World Literature. (p. 306).

Pushkin, A. (1995). *Eugene Onegin. A Novel in Verse* (J.E. Falen, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (p. 240).

Pushkin, A. (1999). *Eugene Onegin. A Novel in Verse* (D. Hofstadter, Trans.). Basic Books, A Member of the Perseus Books Group. (p. 137).

Pushkin, A. (1999). *Eugene Onegin and Other Stories* (Ch. Johnston, Trans.). Everyman's Library. (p. 240).

Pushkin, A. (2008). *Eugene Onegin. A Novel in Verse* (S. Mitchell, Trans.). Penguin Books. (p. 244).

Pushkin, A. (1990). *Eugene Onegin. A Novel in Verse* (V. Nabokov, Trans.). Princeton University Press.

Rarenko, M.B. (2014). *Khudozhestvennyi perevod: terminologicheskii slovar-spravochnik* [Literary Translation: Terminological Dictionary]. Moscow: INION RAN. (p. 379).

Russian Subtitles for the Movie Onegin. (1999). Retrieved September 28, 2017, from http://vvord.ru/tekst-filma/Onegin/7

Russian Viewers' Reviews of the Movie "Onegin". (n.d.). Retrieved September 1, 2017, from https://www.kinopoisk.ru/film/onegin-1998-5528/

Sapir, E. (2001). *Izbrannye trudy po yazykoznaniyu i kulturologii* [Selected Works on Linguistics and Cultural Studies]. Moscow: Progress. (p. 655).

Shapinskaya, Ye.N. (2015). *"Evgenii Onegin" glazami Drugogo: britanskaya interpretatsiya v kino i na opernoi stsene* ["Eugene Onegin" in the Eyes of the Other: British Interpretation in Cinema and on Opera Stage]. Retrieved September 1, 2017, from http://cult-cult.ru/eugene-onegin-from-the-point-of-view-of-the-other/

Schleiermacher, Fr. (1992). On the Different Methods of Translation. In J. Biguenet, & R. Schulte (Eds.), *Theories of Translation: an Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida* (pp. 36-54). Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press.

Simmons, E. (1938). English Translations of Eugene Onegin. *The Slavonic and East European Review, 17*(49), 198-208.

Toury, G. (1995). The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation. In *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (pp. 53-69). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Winter, W. (1961). Impossibilities of Translation. In W. Arrowsmith, & R. Shattuck (Eds.), *The Craft and Context of Translation* (pp. 68-82). Doubleday Anchor.

World Opera Statistics. Retrieved September 1, 2017, from http://operanews.ru/13051203.html