

UNIVERSIDADE DE SÃO PAULO
FACULDADE DE FILOSOFIA LETRAS E CIÊNCIAS HUMANAS
DEPARTAMENTO DE LETRAS CLÁSSICAS E VERNÁCULAS
PROGRAMA DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM LETRAS CLÁSSICAS

Rafael Nogueira de Carvalho Frate

**Horace in Russia: A study on reception during the
First Generation of Russian Poetry (1703-1765)**

**Horácio na Rússia: Estudo sobre recepção
na primeira geração da poesia russa (1703-1765)**

Versão Corrigida

São Paulo

2022

UNIVERSIDADE DE SÃO PAULO
FACULDADE DE FILOSOFIA LETRAS E CIÊNCIAS HUMANAS
DEPARTAMENTO DE LETRAS CLÁSSICAS E VERNÁCULAS
PROGRAMA DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM LETRAS CLÁSSICAS

Rafael Nogueira de Carvalho Frate

**Horace in Russia: A study on reception during the
First Generation of Russian Poetry (1703-1765)**

**Horácio na Rússia: Estudo sobre recepção
na primeira geração da poesia russa (1703-1765)**

Tese apresentada ao PPG em Letras Clássicas do
Departamento de Letras Clássicas e Vernáculos da
Faculdade de Filosofia, Letras e Ciências Humanas
da Universidade de São Paulo, para a obtenção
do título de Doutor em Letras Clássicas.

São Paulo

2022

Autorizo a reprodução e divulgação total ou parcial deste trabalho, por qualquer meio convencional ou eletrônico, para fins de estudo e pesquisa, desde que citada a fonte.

Catálogo na Publicação
Serviço de Biblioteca e Documentação
Faculdade de Filosofia, Letras e Ciências Humanas da Universidade de São Paulo

F844h Frate, Rafael
Horace in Russia: A study on reception during the
First Generation of Russian Poetry (1703-1765) /
Rafael Frate; orientadora Elaine Sartorelli - São
Paulo, 2022.
267 f.

Tese (Doutorado)- Faculdade de Filosofia, Letras e
Ciências Humanas da Universidade de São Paulo.
Departamento de Letras Clássicas e Vernáculas. Área
de concentração: Letras Clássicas.

1. Horácio. 2. tradução. 3. literatura russa. 4.
Século XVIII. I. Sartorelli, Elaine, orient. II.
Título.

Acknowledgements

I shall excuse myself and write the first part of these acknowledgements in Portuguese, for it is directed to Brazilians:

Em primeiro lugar, agradeço a meus pais Denis e Cristiane Frate, que sempre me apoiaram de todos os modos em tudo o que me propus a fazer. Agradeço a minha irmã Beatriz, minha querida amiga que sempre esteve lá nos piores momentos para me trazer alegrias e risadas e um pouco de leveza para minha vida, sem a qual esta tese não teria saído. Agradeço também à Sofia Mistieri, minha cunhadinha, que foi uma maravilhosa adição à família e a todas as pessoas queridas que tenho em minha volta. Agradeço a meus queridos primos Vinícius Frate Paranhos e Micael Bretas, que também sempre estiveram lá para os processos de descompressão. Agradeço também a minha avó Daicy Mareto de Carvalho e minha tia Dilea Frate.

Agradeço à minha orientadora, Elaine Cristine Sartorelli, por sempre ter acreditado em meu projeto e minhas capacidades e dado total liberdade para eu desenvolver a pesquisa aqui apresentada. Agradeço aos professores Pedro Baroni Schmidt e Bruno Barreto Gomide por participarem de minha banca de qualificação, fazerem observações fundamentais para orientar melhor os rumos deste trabalho e gentilmente terem se prontificado a participar da banca da defesa desta tese.

Agradeço imensamente aos funcionários do departamento de Letras Clássicas e Vernáculas da FFLCH – USP, Vera Mendes e Lucas Toriani, por sempre, pacientemente, explicarem os trâmites burocráticos e institucionais da pós-graduação e terem me socorrido de enrascadas as quais não teria ideia de como resolver sem uma preciosa ajuda. Agradeço também ao professor Pablo Schwartz Frydman, chefe da área de Letras Clássicas do DLCV-

USP, por ter sido extremamente solícito e compreensivo nas requisições de extensão do prazo do depósito da tese e, principalmente, pela prontidão em requisitar à CAPES a extensão do período de recebimento de minha bolsa de estudos.

Agradeço a meus grandes amigos, mestres e parceiros no caminho das letras clássicas por sempre emprestarem seu tempo para intermináveis conversas que sem dúvida contribuíram de um modo ou de outro com este trabalho: Tadeu Andrade, Márcio Mauá Chaves, Leonardo Zuccaro, Ticiano Lacerda, Rafael Brunhara, Caio Gerardes e Alexandre Hasegawa. Agradeço também a meus amigos fora do mundo da academia e das clássicas, que são muitos, além das minhas forças para mencionar nesse momento, mas fiquem registrados pelo menos dois: Pedro Iacovini e Antonio Valoto Jr. Agradeço, a minha ex-professora de russo, Tatiana Lárkina, sem a qual eu não teria acesso ao momento trabalhado nesta tese. Por fim, devo mencionar uma das principais responsáveis por essa tese, minha terapeuta Miramaia Torres Graça, que foi decisiva no apoio psicológico e emocional de que constantemente precisei no doloroso processo de tirar esta tese de dentro de mim. A todos vocês esta tese é dedicada.

A todas as demais pessoas em meu universo e igualmente importantes, meu obrigado.

Agradeço, por fim, à CAPES pela bolsa institucional e pelo valoroso apoio oferecido por meio do programa Print para minha estada na Universidade de Oxford.

Now back to English to thank the main English-speaking supporters of this thesis:

To professor Andrew Kahn who so kindly received me and my project at Oxford in 2020, reading the first drafts of this thesis and accepting to be part of the panel to evaluate it.

To Ms. Abigail Appleby, Graduate Studies Officer in the Faculty of Medieval and Modern Languages at Oxford University for having showed unparalleled kindness in orienting me through the bureaucratic intricacies of her institution.

To Almaz and Jazgul Almazbek, who both received me in their home in Oxford and showed perfect hospitality while I was there, in such a bleak moment as the lockdown that followed the outbreak of the COVID-19 Pandemic.

RESUMO

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Horácio; tradução; recepção dos clássicos; literatura russa; século 18

A presente tese oferece um panorama da recepção do poeta romano Horácio na Rússia nas décadas que se seguiram às reformas de Pedro I, o Grande. Neste trabalho são apresentados: um relato da recepção de Horácio em terras russas nos momentos que precederam as reformas de Pedro, o Grande; um estudo sobre imitação poética como entendido pelos poetas da chamada primeira geração da poesia russa; uma análise das primeiras traduções da *Arte Poética* de Horácio, produzidas por Vassíli Kirílovitch Trediakóvski e Nikolai Nikítitch Popóvski; um relato sobre a primeira tradução das *Epístolas* de Horácio produzida por Antiokh Dmítrevitch Kantemir. Esta tese se encerra com uma conclusão que aponta para a recepção subsequente de Horácio na Rússia, bem como considerações sobre tradução como praticada por seus maiores poetas e letrados. Também se oferecem apêndices com os prefácios desses tradutores a suas traduções, traduzidos de maneira inédita para o português e o inglês.

ABSTRACT

KEYWORDS: Horace, Translation; Reception of Classics, Russian Literature, 18th Century

The following doctoral thesis offers an overview on the reception of Horace in Russia, in the aftermath of the reforms conducted by Emperor Peter I. In this thesis are presented: an account of the previous reception of Horace before Peter the Great's reforms; a study on poetic imitation as understood by the writers from the so-called first generation of Russian poetry; an analysis of the first translations to Russian of *Horace's Ars Poetica* by Vassily Kirilovich Trediakovsky and Nikolay Nikitich Popovsky; an account of the first translation of Horace's Epistles by Antiokh Dmitrievich Kantemir. The thesis closes with concluding remarks pointing to the subsequent reception of Horace in Russia as well as some considerations on the nature of translation as practiced by its most prominent poets and men of letters. Also are offered appendixes with translations to Portuguese and English of the main prefaces to these translations produced by their respective translators.

Contents

- **Introduction (pp. 10-28)**
- **Chapter 1 – Preceding reception of Horace in Russia (pp. 29-59)**
- **Chapter 2 – Polemics in the 1st generation (pp. 60-89)**
- **Chapter 3 – Trediakovsky, Popovsky and the *Ars Poetica* (pp. 90-158)**
- **Chapter 4 – Kantemir and the *Epistles* (pp. 159-190)**
- **Conclusion (pp. 191-202)**
- **Appendixes**
 - a. **Kantemir's Dedication and Preface to the Epistles**
 - b. **Trediakovsky's translation of the AP**
 - c. **Popovsky's translation of the AP**
- **References**

Note on transliterations and translations

For the English text I have followed the simplified Library of Congress transliteration standards. For the translations presented in Portuguese, I have followed the standards observed in the academic practice of University of São Paulo and the main editorial houses extensively dealing with Russian material.

I chose to translate the passages presented both to Portuguese and English, for the reason of better tackling the nuances Russian text and provide to Portuguese a translation of texts never before published in the language.

Abbreviations

AP – Ars Poetica (Horace)

Epist. – Epistles (Horace)

Sat. – Satires (Horace)

Od. – Odes (Horace)

Epod. – Epodes (Horace)

AS – Academy of Sciences of St. Petersburg

KMA – Kiev-Mohilanian Academy

SGLA – Slav-Greek-Latin Academy

SiP – Sochineniia i Perevody (Trediakovsky)

Popo. – Popovsky's translation of the AP

Introduction

In the beginning of the Eighteenth Century, Russia underwent one of the greatest upheavals of its history. The reforms promoted by the Tsar-turned-Emperor Peter I were decisive to bring the realm into Modernity. A true revolution with all its ambivalences was effected during Peter the Great's reign, in which a significant part of the cultural scenery was abruptly transformed, relegating a deemed outdated, obscurantist, traditional Slavic Orthodox worldview in favour of a European, modern, relatively Illuminist perspective. This new paradigm was imposed in the creation of a self-image that was, to put it shortly, "readily distinguishable from the pre-revolutionary one".¹ In the Eighteenth Century, Modernity was inaugurated in Russia in a new military capacity, a new bureaucratic apparatus, and, especially in a new culture.

In an extensive semiotic reconceptualization, the realm's ecclesiastical structure was fully reorganized and subjected to the State. Now, the Russian Orthodox Church no longer represented a determinant political factor in the conduction of the government, being relegated to a ceremonial status. A new, secular, culture was abruptly implanted on the grounds of the Tsardom, guided by the technical, fashion, and intellectual trends, of Amsterdam, Utrecht, London, the German principates, and Paris, all of them places visited by Peter, first with his Grand Embassy in the years 1697/1698, and then nineteen years later in his second journey to the West (1716/1717).² From now on, Russia would be an European State and its subjects were to behave accordingly.

¹ CRACRAFT, 2004, pg. 12.

² The Grand Embassy of 1697-98 was the first time a great number of Russian subjects followed by its tsar (travelling incognito) went to Western Europe in an official mission to consolidate military alliances and to provide economic cooperation in face of the conflicts with the Ottoman Empire, that involved Russia in the last decade of 17th C., but, above all it was an opportunity to observe European customs, acquire new technologies

Such paradigm shift was carried out in a geopolitical background that contained the many struggles and wars the realm saw during Peter's reign, the most important of which was the conflict that consolidated Russia as a relevant modern European military power: the Great Northern War, waged chiefly against the Kingdom of Sweden, headed by Charles XII. The modernization thrust bolstered experimental Science giving it its first specialised institutions, that would serve as the main caterer of specialised personnel to man the newly established Russian Imperial Army and the huge bureaucratic apparatus that had to be created and developed by an ever-increasing taxation system. This new system would place the heaviest burden on the huge mass that made up the peasantry and petty bourgeoisie in Russia. For the vast majority of the people, life would remain the same vale of tears, but for a few intrepid fortunate ones the new structures created by the Tsar could be seen as a way to change life altogether. Some of them, sons of fishermen, priests, street peddlers, peasants, would take part in this new culture and in the affairs of the Court and State, to the point of reaching the highest echelons of the Empire, and the highest spots of literary and political glory.

This revolution entailed the creation of a wholly new culture in the higher strata of Russian feudal society that faced other challenges in its modernization process. The formal, prestigious, cultural language of the realm, was an old tradition inherited from the first Slavic Fathers of the Russian Church, already very distinct from the language spoken in early-18th C. By the orders and enactments of the Tsar, the new books, alphabet primers, translations and original works were to be published in the *simple, colloquial*, Muscovite vernacular, now very different from the old, ecclesiastical, highly solemn Church Slavonic. Another problem tackled was the almost absolute inexistence of a publishing system in the realm. In Peter's reign were

(especially in the shipbuilding business) and satiate the unquenchable curiosity of its young leader. It went through many German states, the Netherlands and England and, upon its return, changed Russian autocratic procedures forever. In Peter's second journey, he went especially to France, now traveling in the official condition of head of state. For a literary account of the enterprise, cf. Massie, 2012, pp. 187-352 and 760-800.

inaugurated several new publishing houses, that would hugely expand the activities of the single publishing institution of the country, the *Pechatny Dvor*, under control of the Patriarchate of Moscow.³

Throughout the 18th C., in the wake of the reforms of Peter the Great, the new language would develop its literary output to become one of the most powerful world literatures. Poetry in Russia started its development in the first decades of the century, in a moment its first men of letters had an open field to insert themselves, forming the language that would be eventually perfected in its elocution by Pushkin.⁴ The main actors in this thesis are the first writers who helped, effectively or fruitlessly, set the foundations of the new language of the newly created polity, no longer headed by a Tsar, but by an Emperor.

For the Tsardom of Russia, officially established in 1547 with the ascension to the Russian throne by Ivan IV the Terrible (1530-1584), was most eloquently transformed into the Russian Empire by Peter I, as the foremost symbol of the New Russia that was to leave behind her strictly religious Orthodox past. New manners of display of power, pomp and glory were needed to refurbish the old ways of a polity that used to call herself the “third Rome”: starting in the 15th C., following the ideology of legitimation of power through the emulation of a projected glorious past of ancient Rome known as *translatio imperii*, transference of empire, Moscow and her Tsar,⁵ under the blessings of the Patriarch in the city, were made the true

³ For the most comprehensive reference on the history of publishing in Russia, cf. Marker, 1985.

⁴ Cf. The letters from Prince I.A. Musin-Pushkin to Fedor Polikarpov, then head of the Muscovite printing press, informing about Peter’s dissatisfaction with one of his Church Slavonic translations, and the tsar’s general linguistic directives for the simple, colloquial language to be used in the the new printed publications in the realm. Cf. Zhivov, 2009 pp. 65-73.

⁵ Tsar is another European autocratic title that developed from the roman cognomen Caesar, adopted after Augustus as a nobiliary title. It reached Russia via Byzantine Empire and started to be a more popular form of address to its monarchs in late-15th C., after the fall of Constantinople and the marriage of Grand Prince of Moscow to princess Sophia Palaiologina, niece of the last Byzantine Emperor Constantine XI Palaiologos. The title in the Church Slavonic form of Цесарь was officially adopted in the coronation of Ivan IV (1547). For a comprehensive account on the development of the title, along with the use of *Samoderzhets* (Autocrat) cf. De Madariaga, 1998, pp. 15 ff.

successors of the Christian Rome of St. Peter. Russia was made the recipient of the heritage of Christ, fallen into heresy in Italy, established in Constantinople, and after being sacked and taken by the infidels, transferred permanently, until the end of times, to the banks of the Moscow River.⁶ The Third Rome idea represented the inheritance of true Christianity and it played a decisive role in maintaining the Patriarchate of Moscow in 1589, in equal levels of prestige as that of the Tsar.

The transformation of Russia into an empire was a particular variation of this ideology of transference of power from the great first Empire. Now Russia also sought to legitimate her own present glory through the emulation of Rome; not the traditional, organically developed throughout history, Christian Rome, but an abrupt, revolutionary approximation to the Ancient, Pagan Rome as it was during the Principate of Augustus. On the 22nd of October (2nd of November O.S.) 1721, an institution established by Peter a few years earlier (in 1712) to aid the monarch in his executive functions, the Senate, proposed in a ceremony that had Latin as one of its official languages, that Tsar Piotr Alekseevich, be turned into *Imperator Petrus Primus*. In addition, the same ceremony bestowed upon him the title *Magnus*, the Great.⁷

By turning to the glories of the first Rome, not only the state institutions were reformed, but, especially, the representations of power were given classical imagery, that frequently took the forms of the old pagan gods, in line with Western European depictions, now very different from the plain, inverted perspective of the icon. Such representations cast aside the strict Orthodox culture of Muscovy and promoted the new, classical culture of the recently founded City of St. Petersburg (1703).⁸ Many are the images representing Peter crowned in laurels,

⁶ As put in one of the most eloquent documents advancing this ideology, monk Filofei's letter to grand prince Vasily II (excerpts quoted in Baehr, 1978; for more information and bibliography on the subject of Moscow as the Third Rome, cf. Wolf, 1959).

⁷ Wes, 1992, pp. 33-37.

⁸ For the reconfiguration of pictorial representations and imagery in general in Russia, cf. Cracraft, 1997.

displaying the pomp of his modern, Europeanised Empire, surrounded by muses and the gods was the new way the Empire wanted to be viewed.

One of the closest associates of Peter and possibly the most eloquent and cultivated supporter of his reforms, the cleric which will receive an especial mention in the first chapter, Feofan Prokopovich, named Peter in one of his homilies *Pontifex Maximus* of the Russian Orthodox Church, helping to accomplish the structural reforms that would abolish the Patriarchate and create the Holy Synod, an organ of the state controlled by a lay *Oberprokuror*. It would not take long before the first literary experiments promoted the apotheosis of the Emperor, elevating him and the other monarchs to a divine status.⁹

In the letters, the approximation with Ancient Rome was no different. The new Russian language was to turn to the models of Classical Antiquity in creating its own new compositions. The first generation of Russian poets had as principal concerns the establishment of the form that this new language would employ in its poetical compositions, and the establishment of a canon from which they would draw inspiration for their own emulated works. Ancient Greece and especially Rome were the foremost sources of invention, and the greatest writers of the past definitely consolidated in Russia the notoriety they had throughout Western European history. Among these writers, *Quintus Horatius Flaccus* played a particularly prominent role. Possibly the second most influential ancient writer in 18th C. Russia, and the single ancient poet that was uninterruptedly cultivated in the whole span of the history of Russian poetry, Horace was translated, imitated, and emulated by virtually all poets that composed in the language enacted by the rough guidelines set by Peter the Great.¹⁰

At first conveyed in translations whose main objectives were to informatively render the meaning of the original Latin, usually translating word-by-word, trying to maintain the

⁹ Cf. below pp. XX.

¹⁰ Cf. Busch, 1964, pg. 16.

original the syntax of the source language, chiefly as an aid to future readers (and a model, positive or negative, to future writers), Horace started to be more freely appropriated by the significant number of writers that began to appear in the second half of the century. By now, the motherland would be headed by the only other monarch to receive the epithet “the Great” in the Romanov dynasty, Catherine II. During her reign, Russian language could already boast a literary field with dozens of active participants, in which she herself took part. Russia could now boast a poet sufficiently departed from the traditional models to originally sing the particularities of his times and attitudes toward life, in a manner that greatly resembles Horace’s own character. This was Gavril Romanovich Derzhavin (1743 - 1815), possibly the greatest poet of the 18th C., who would reach a level of simplicity, elegance, and elocutionary mean, foreshadowing the golden age of Aleksandr Sergeevich Pushkin (1799-1837) and his contemporaries.

Horace also appears in this apex, the moment in which the Sun of Russian poetry fully blasted through the works of Pushkin and many others great names of this generation. This was the moment when the poetic language of Russian gained its full elocutionary maturity. Here not only Horace appears in translation, but also as an attempt at emulation as conducted half a century before. The Venutian is now here depurated, taken in his essence through the best and most relevant part of his lessons, applied to wholly original works of art that were eventually credited with being the true, or at least apparent beginnings of Russian poetry and literature in general. These later appropriations of Horace will not be treated in this thesis and shall be left for a future investigation. Here I am rather concerned with the cornerstones of this great edifice, that, in spite of its significance, receive very little attention overall.

This thesis focuses in the moment when Russian poetry establishes its formal and canonical bases. Perhaps the most important name in this first development is that of Mikhail Vasilevich Lomonosov, the poet-polymath who, besides mythically inaugurating Russian

scientific tradition, effectively established the poetic forms that every Russian has to master if they want to write poetry in the language.¹¹ As well known,¹² Lomonosov was a pioneer in several undertakings in Russian poetry and philology. Besides the foundational documents of poetic forms which will be mentioned below, Lomonosov was also the author of the first rhetorical treatise and the first grammar of the new language. Despite not extensively translating and appropriating the works of Horace, Lomonosov played an active role in the formation of two other poets who took a great deal from the Venetian and will play a central role in this thesis. Lomonosov, in addition, is credited with starting one of the greatest Horatian traditions in Russian literature, the several appropriations of Odes 3.30, by several of its greatest and lesser poets.

The object of this thesis is, therefore, to investigate the impact of some of Horace's poetry in the first generation of modern Russian poets, in a moment when their main aspirations were to be the pioneers and founding fathers of the new Russian language. Many of them ended up completely forgotten, and particularly two of them would either be transformed in a monstrous caricature that perhaps exaggerated his less fortunate passages or would be no more than a page or two of literary history, due to the insistence in the poetic forms inherited from Polish or Church Slavonic. The former was the case of Vasily Kirilovich Trediakovsky (1703 – 1768), the first translator of a modern secular novel to Russian,¹³ the first theoretician and reformer of poetic forms in the language, and the first translator of the Horace's *Ars Poetica*; the latter was the case of Antiokh Dmitrevich Kantemir (1708 – 1744), the Satirist of Peter the Great, the first to write secular poetry in Russian in poetic genres inherited from Antiquity such

¹¹ The myth and actuality of Lomonosov as a founding father of Russian science. Cf. Usitalo, 2013.

¹² For a brief account on Lomonosov's achievements in the realm of letters, I refer to my master's thesis Frate, 2016.

¹³ Trediakovsky translated in 1735 Paul Tallemand's allegorical novel, *A journey to the Island of Love*.

as the satire, the first to translate the *Carmina Anacreontea*,¹⁴ the first to translate a complete Horatian book, the Epistles.

Other now forgotten men of letters fell into oblivion for different reasons. One of them was overshadowed by the towering figure represented by his teacher and mentor, Mikhail Lomonosov. Nikolay Nikitich Popovsky (1730-1760) produced relatively little in his brief life but left important translations for his times and for the history of translation in Russian literary practices, especially if one is to consider the debates and polemics that took place at its dawn. One of these is the first literary translation of the *Ars Poetica*, published in 1753, the same year as Trediakovsky's informative prose translation published in his two-volume *Compositions and Translations*, a balance of his works, now increasingly waning in popularity in face of the growing popularity of his two younger rivals, Lomonosov and the poet, publicist and father of Russian theatre, Aleksandr Petrovich Sumarokov (1717-1777).

Another student and friend of Lomonosov's, Ivan Semënovich (?) Barkov (1732-1768) was someone whose subsequent acclaim was more favourable, but would take long to be published and integrated in the Russian canon, on the account of the marginal status of his poetry. He was another satirist, who also served as secretary to Lomonosov, being very important in the collection of the unpublished poetic works of the great polymath. He was also the first to recover the by then forgotten legacy of Kantemir, writing his *Life* and organizing the first edition of his *Satires*. Barkov, however, entered history as the first to introduce Russian obscene language, *mat*, into poetry. His base, vile, satirical verve was a counterpoint to the more sober, Horatian, Kantemir, and his long unpublished but broadly circulating obscene poetry granted him legendary status that poses a great challenge to his biographers. His celebrated *Ode to the Cock*, and *Ode to the Cunt* were the first time in Russia when the elevated

¹⁴ Lyrical poems that enjoyed great popularity in all throughout Western Europe, attributed to the Ancient Greek poet Anacreon of Teos (c. 582-c.485 b.C.), but actually written in late antiquity.

elocution of the ode was employed to parodical purposes, initiating a process of reconceptualization of genres that led to their dissolution and broadening in the beginning of the 19th C. Lastly, Barkov was an accomplished Latinist, responsible for translating Horace's Satires.

The Horatian translations of these literary pioneers, particularly those of Kantemir, Trediakovsky and Popovsky, make up the corpus analysed in this thesis, taken in their particular contexts, literary controversies and quarrels. The period mentioned in the title (1703-1765) takes arbitrarily the date of birth and death of two of its most active figures: the birth of Vasily Trediakovsky, the oldest pioneer of the first generation and the death of Mikhail Lomonosov, the most famous and possibly the greatest of his time. It is a way to broaden the scope of the first generation and look at the Petrine years and the preceding generation headed by Feofan Prokopovich, the last great name of the Slavonic tradition. This period accommodates well all the translations analysed and helps to better provide the context in which they were produced.

Consequently, its first main objective is to present these translations in formal analyses that focus on their ends, strategies, formal approaches, conducted preferably in their own terms as presented in the paratextual information they frequently included. Its second goal is to provide a general overview to a moment in Russian literature generally neglected and barely treated in depth. Its third objective is to present the thesis that Horace was the principal *magister litterarum*, master of letters, for this generation, whose translations broke ground not only to the future reception of Horace and other Latin poets but presented a first model to the poets who would shine on in the following decades and whose appropriations of Horace's elocution and spirit were a relevant formative element to their work. Last but not least, its final objective is to bridge two areas of literary studies that usually do not intercommunicate in the academe, that of Russian/Slavonic studies and Classical Studies.

Central to the argument of the thesis will be the definition and discussion of concepts such as imitation, emulation, servility, literary authority and other production processes and outcomes that guided the poetic context of those times (and, for that matter, the whole preromantic history of letters). To understand how these processes shaped the poetic and translation practices inherited by the poetry of preceding Germans, Frenchmen, Italians, Romans, Ancient Greeks, investigating how they understood them and, many times incoherently, accused their fellows of improper use of them, will be a helpful way to determine a future shift in the poetic practices, which increasingly, but hardly ever completely, put the emphasis in self-expression, originality and authenticity. Thus, the present thesis is divided in four chapters:

Chapter 1 sets the context by situating the thesis with relevant information on the previous reception of Horace's works in Western Europe, especially concerning the translations that reached Russia carried out in late-17th/early 18th Cc. I present here, as well, an account of the previous literary culture in Russia, a moment in which Latinity permeated the tsardom through monastery schools and theological academies, that sought to imitate the Jesuit *collegia* so abundant in the West and, especially, in Poland, a realm with an already extensively developed and prestigious literary language, whose influence was central to the modest development of poetic forms in pre-Petrine Russia, and was debated by most of the characters to play a role in this thesis: revised in the case of Kantemir and Trediakovsky, and altogether abandoned with the advent of Lomonosov's *Letter on the Rules of Russian Versification*, and the *Ode on the Taking of Khotin* (both from 1739), the two milestones that, in theory and in practice, defined the contemporary forms of Russian poetry.

By providing this context I intend not only to situate the Church Slavonic formation of the principal actors of the first generation, but to show that Latinity, Latin language and its main cultural artifacts, although modestly, have never entirely ceased to be cultivated at least

in Greater Russia. I shall dedicate a section of this first chapter to discuss the only higher educational institution, that passed into Russian hands in 1654 when the tsardom incorporated West-Bank Ukraine. The School of Kiev, founded in 1635 was alma mater to the many learned men who went to Moscow in the second half of 17th C., participating or serving as guide to the other institution that would appear in the 1680's in Moscow, the Zaikonospassky College, later known as the Slav-Greek-Latin Academy. The Academy of Kiev would have in staff none other than Feofan Prokopovich, the most eloquent of Peter the Great's subjects, the all-powerful cleric who was the mastermind behind Peter's church reforms and the main legitimator of his absolute power. Feofan, when professor of the institution, wrote a manual on rhetoric and another on the art of poetry to be used with his students. Prokopovich's *Three Books on Poetic Art* allow us to catch a glimpse on how Latin culture was present in these first formative Petrine years. The doctrine on poetic imitation presented by Prokopovich will serve as a link to my next chapter.

Chapter 2 discusses the practices and doctrines of imitation, emulation and, above all, translation, as understood and debated by Trediakovsky and Sumarokov. In it I will mention the quarrels and disputes that made the most of the late-1740's/mid-1750's, when Trediakovsky started to be outshined by the other two personalities that took hold of the literary scene of the 1750's, Lomonosov and Sumarokov. The illustrious quarrels between the latter and Trediakovsky, with the first blow being given in a purported 'Russian poetic art', Sumarokov's *Second Epistle, On Versification*, and the subsequent letter altercations between the two were the first to promote Trediakovsky's bad reputation of a poetaster, later to receive the caricature of an evil, jealous, vain, chthonic monster.¹⁵

¹⁵ Cf. Reyfman, 1990, for a better detailed inquiry on the construction of the myth of Trediakovsky as a terrible poet.

The main aspects of this quarrel are centred in the question of poetic imitation and the limits that make one's imitation either servile and weak, or strong and accomplished. As we shall see, many of the accusations one addresses against the other are the product rather of an anxious, vain and sometimes empty quest for the glory of being the "first to plant free footsteps on virgin soil, walking not where others trod."¹⁶ These quarrels usually would only amount to trifles that mask incoherent, incompetent or unwilling readings from both parts and a desire to conquer literary glory with works that could neither match the future expectations of Russian readers and writers, nor the language's fullest rhetorical and linguistic potentialities. The chapter ends with the comparison of their views on imitation with the teachings old Horace present, mainly, in his *Epistles*, whose translation will be tackled in the fourth chapter.

Chapter 3 discusses and analyses the translations of the *Ars Poetica* by Trediakovsky and Popovsky, in another quarrel that, although not openly expressed, forced Trediakovsky to painstakingly explain his positions as translator in the collected works he published in 1753, *Compositions and Translations (Sochineniia i Perevody)* in possibly a response to a debate as to whether prose translations of poetic works were legitimate. Trediakovsky's prose translation of the *Ars Poetica* was promptly responded with another translation by the young man who had been co-opted by Lomonosov during his student years in the University of the Academy of Sciences of St. Petersburg. Popovsky's translation was diametrically opposite from Trediakovsky's in its objectives and perspectives. It is a verse translation in syllabo-tonic hexametric distiches (paired rhymes) that seeks to address completely different facets of translation from Trediakovsky's: not an informative semantically-oriented translation but an artistic, free adaptation, constrained by its specific formal choices, that attempt to produce a self-standing poem not especially concerned about conveying the specific references of the

¹⁶ Hor. Epist. 1.19, vv. 21-22. Tr. FAIRCLOUGH, 2005. pg. 383.

original text. Unlike Trediakovsky, Popovsky tries to erect another monument in the “afterlife” of the original composition.¹⁷

Before the analysis proper, I intend to investigate Popovsky’s translation skills in the light of his teacher’s Lomonosov, as exposed in his 1747 Rhetoric, another of his milestones in the realm of Russian philology. I shall point out to some translation strategies Lomonosov provided to adapt the old Latin dactyl hexameter into Russian, and how these forms used by Lomonosov were subsequently received by other poets and translators when rendering works such as the Homeric epics and other Classical hexametric compositions. I will also provide a brief account on to the only extant Horatian translation by Lomonosov, that started one of the most enduring Horatian traditions in Russia, his appropriation of *Odes* 3.30.

It is on the background of Lomonosov’s translations that I wish to situate Popovsky’s translation of the *Ars Poetica*, comparing it with Trediakovsky’s in its own terms. In the analyses of these two translations, I intend to address the different strategies both translators use to convey important Horatian devices, such as the use of the gnome, or sapiential maxim, arguably one of the most remarkable characteristics of this poetry. I shall address the problems of the particular references to the Roman world and society, obscure literary figures and rhetorical concepts that might prove difficult to a reader unacquainted with Classical antiquity in 18th C. Russia. Due to limitations, I shall restrict the analysis to the first 153 verses of the AP, considered the first part of the poem. As the main guides to the Latin text, I shall use the most authoritative modern commentaries to the AP, Brink’s edition as a way of better organizing such a difficult and apparently disorganized text.¹⁸ The other modern commentary used is Paolo Fedelli’s, published in 1997.¹⁹ However, I make more extensive use of the 18th

¹⁷ As put by Walter Benjamin in his Task of the Translator. Benjamin, 1997.

¹⁸ Brink, 1971.

¹⁹ Fedelli, 1997.

C. edition and commentaries that oriented not only Trediakovsky and Popovsky in translating the AP, but also Kantemir with the Epistles, the joint edition between the philologist André Dacier and the Jesuit priest Noël-Étienne Sanadon, who were published together with side-by-side translations and commentaries to each verse of the AP.²⁰ As we shall see, at least both Kantemir and Trediakovsky based their work in this joint venture for both the translation itself and the paratextual notes he furnished for the reader unschooled in the Classics.

Chapter 4 discusses Antiokh Kantemir's translation of the Epistles along with the prefatory pieces provided by the author: a Dedication to Empress Elizabeth and its Preface to the Reader, where he exposes the facets of his craft, along with the objectives, the hopes and other details relevant to his translations. In this chapter I provide a biographical excerpt of the poet-translator mainly based on Radovsky's account of his biography in relation to the Academy of Sciences of St. Petersburg, the first modern scientific institution in Russia.²¹ Also provided is a discussion on the form he employed for both his translations and compositions, based on his own theoretical accounts, contained in his Preface and in his own treatise on the subject, the Letter to a friend from Khariton Makentin (an anagram with Kantemir's name), a polemical piece in the debate on the choice of the best versification system for Russian Language. The positions displayed in these accounts would ultimately relegate Kantemir to obscurity, making him "not so much the beginning of the History of Russian Literature, as the end of an era in Russian letters".²²

Due to the limitations and the scope of this thesis, I will not focus on analysing Kantemir's translations themselves, as I shall do in chapter 3 with the beginning of the AP, but I present an overview of his positions as translator by looking at the preface to the translations

²⁰ Dacier, Sanadon, 1735.

²¹ Radovsky, 1959.

²² Belinsky, XXXX. Cf. *infra*, pg.

of Horace's Epistles and the prefatory dedication to Empress Elizabeth, where one can see several of his objectives in presenting Horace's Epistles. Unfortunately, it proved to be impossible an overview of Barkov's life, let alone a detailed analysis of his translations of the Satires and an extensive consideration of his position in Russian and Classical Studies, something among the next steps on the academic intentions, but I shall mention a bit of his works and the translations in the concluding remarks of this thesis.

I also offer in the Appendixes translations to Portuguese and English of some of the principal theoretical texts commented in this thesis. Appendix A contains the Dedication to Empress Elizabeth and the introduction to the translation of Horace's Epistles and Life by Kantemir. Appendix B contains the preface to Trediakovsky's *Sochineniia i Perevody* (hereinafter *SiP*), analysed in Chapter 3. Except when otherwise indicated, I used H.R. Fairclough's translations of Horace's hexametric production for the Loeb Classical Library carried out completely in 1929. All remaining translations presented in this thesis are mine, except when otherwise indicated.

As for the main references to the reception of Horatian hexametric production and the general historic-literary background that provided the basis of this thesis, I would like to mention the following works and studies:

Berkov, 1935 – *Rannye russkie perevochki Goratsiia* is the first contemporary article dedicated to the first translators of Horace in Russian, from which most subsequent works on the subject are tributaries. This brief account of the Horatian output in Russia by the poets of the first generation was the first in concisely mapping the main translations and translators who dedicated their efforts to conveying the old Venutian into the new Russian language. By its own author's account, it is no further than an overview awaiting future researchers delve more deeply into the matter. Berkov, one of the founding fathers of the Soviet 18th C. Russian studies

is an inescapable reference when it comes to studying the period with his magisterial works offering a most comprehensive overview on the several aspects of Russian literature in the 18th Century.²³

Busch, 1964 – *Horaz in Russland* is an important reference material specific to the subject of Horatian reception in Russia. It is a survey that presents all the appropriations of Horace from the 18th C. to the 20th C. and concludes the mapping started by Berkov's ground-breaking article. It is a comprehensive account that spans the whole of Russian literature until the 1960's, being very systematic while concise. A useful distinction carried out in the book is between the different methods of appropriation and the several forms the poet was used by Russians literates who ventured in conveying him into the Russian, like Horace as a literary critic, a singer of friendship, poet of love, politics, philosophy and so on. Its methods of appropriation – translation, adaptation, imitation (*podrazhanie*), parody – are also duly separated and discussed in this work. Being an overview of the whole history of Horatian reception in Russia it does not present much new information on the period studied here and remains secondary material for the purposes of this thesis.

The works by Nadezhda Iurevnaia Alekseeva play here a central role. From her commented edition of Trediakovsky's *Sochineniia i Perevody*, (Trediakovsky, 2009) to her article on the translations of the AP, implying a literary polemic around them, and other issues pointed out therein, this thesis is tributary of such solid scholarly production and have in it the main tributary of the main ideas and intuitions presented in this thesis. Her fundamental book on the history of the Russian ode (Alekseeva, 2005) was very important to provide the historical background represented by the pre-Petrine poetic practices in Russia and the reception of

²³ Among these should be mentioned: Berkov, 1936 – *Lomonosov i literaturnaia polemika ego vremeni* (Lomonosov and the literary polemic of his time); Berkov, 1952 – *Istoriia russkaia zhurnaliskika* (A History of Russian Journalism in the 18th C.); Berkov, 1968 – *Istoriia russkoi literatury VIII veka: Bibliograficheski Ukazatel* (History of Russian Literature in the 18th C.: Bibliographical Index).

Horace in the poetry of its principal writers such as Simeon Polotsky's Horatian appropriations and provided insight to the most practiced poetic genre of the period studied, the solemn panegyric ode. Chapter 4 made use of her article on the notes appended to Kantemir's translations of Horace's Epistles.

Zhivov, 2005, was certainly the most important work for my general theoretical basis on the study of the formation of Russian language in the 18th C. It has guided my path through the often confusing and strenuous topic of 18th C Russian Literature, having followed me ever since I took up the challenge to turn my attentions to the subject. The sheer amount of information therein contained provides the researcher with all the data and references needed to conduct any investigation on the topic and it is definitely a must for anyone interested in delving more deeply into the subject.

My general historical overview relies on Oxford's *A History of Russian Literature*, written by Profs. Kahn, Lipovetsy, Reyfman and Sandler, to which I am greatly indebted. Professor Kahn's chapter on the Eighteenth Century find all the key works and literary events that helped me to settle my historic understanding of the period. Along with his colleagues he writes a most comprehensive, elegantly clear, and helpful account on the history of Russian literature, being perhaps the most important literary overview I received in my own formation. Its main theses and principles and concepts such as Bourdieu's notion of literary field are used all throughout this thesis, being its foremost general reference.

I would also like to mention the works by Giovanna Siedina, especially her doctoral dissertation presented in Harvard University (Siedina, 2014), on the reception of Horace in the several manuals written in Latin as textbooks to the Course of Poetics offered by the Academy of Kiev (hereinafter, AKM). It was certainly a very fortunate discovery that allowed me to form a more comprehensive view on the presence on Latinity in Russian lands, by attenuating the

idea of a total Petrine cultural revolution and aiding to understand the extent of cultural continuity that the poets of the first generation displayed in their oeuvre. Siedina, 2014 was pivotal for the first chapter of this thesis.

The principal index materials used were: The dictionary of Russian writers in the 18th C. (Kotchetkova et al., 1988-2010). A comprehensive and practical source to finding information about every person who has produced any written material in the period in Russia.

The Summarized Catalogue of Russian Books in the 18th C. (Katsprzhak et al. 1962-1976), containing every book published in Russia in the period, essential for verifying the correct dates and facts of the main publications mentioned in this thesis.

The catalogue Ancient Poetry in Russian Translations (Svyasov, 1998) lists every ancient author ever translated into Russian from the 18th C. up to the 20th C., essential in every study on the reception of Classical Antiquity in Russian.

Finally, the Dictionary of Russian language in the 18th C., an ongoing undertaking started in 1984, but unfortunately halted in the word *номпрактовать*. Containing 22 volumes so far it consists in a monumental undertaking that offers the best help in understanding slavonicisms and words that fell out of use or changed in meaning throughout their history in the almost three-and-a-half centuries since the establishment of Russian language, whenever they are available.²⁴

Of special importance, now on the realm of Classical Antiquity, is the *Enciclopedia Oraziana*, above all Volume 3 (1993), which provides all the most useful facts on the modern reception of Horace elsewhere in Europe, with editorial information, translations and other appropriations of the Venutian. Unfortunately, due to the COVID-19 pandemic my access to it

²⁴ Link: <http://feb-web.ru/feb/sl18/slov-abc/>

and several other references was restricted and it was no longer possible for me to make more extensive use of its features, a fact which restricted my access to other crucial books present only physically in the libraries at Oxford University.

These are the premises upon which this thesis is based. If in my concluding remarks I accomplish at least part of the objectives stated above, I will consider it to have played well its role.

Chapter 1 – Preceding reception of Horace in Russia

i First Editions of Horace in Europe

It might be useful for our purposes to offer a brief account of the editorial history of Horace, and a few remarks on his reception in France, that will prove relevant by foregrounding his future reception in Russia.

Horace's *editio princeps* dates from 1471, and was published in Venice, by the House of Basilius, in an already very clear Antiqua typeface, but lacking the expected main editorial information, not including the editor's name, year, nor the place of publication.²⁵ His first edition furnished with the ancient commentaries by ps.-Acro dates from the following year in 1472. In the remaining years of the century, Horace would receive sixty-nine editions, establishing his printed authority in the latter portion of the incunabula era, marked above all by the numerous Italian and Lower-Rhine editors who invested in the new medium.

As the editorial business flourished in other parts of Europe in the 16th C., the editors were increasingly attentive to Classical Antiquity, and it was in France where Horace gained his first authoritative critical editions, with original commentaries and greater philological curation. Dionysus Lambinus (Denis Lambin, 1520-1572) was among the pioneers who brought Horace's complete works to print with an edition in 1561, but the most authoritative editions in the century were brought out by the famous house ran by the Estienne family. One of the most important early editorial houses in the French speaking world, the father and son Robert and Henri Estienne were responsible for hundreds of editions, first in Paris, then in Geneva, following the approximation of Robert with Calvinism. Henri, the son, would

²⁵ There were three partial publications of Horace's works in the 1460's. Cf. E.O., 1996, vol. iii, pp. 357-372. A facsimile can be found at: <https://www.gesamtkatalogderwiegendrucke.de>

eventually become one of greatest Hellenists of his time with the publication of 74 Greek authors, 18 of which had their *Editio Princeps* published by his hands.²⁶ Horace was published by this illustrious house first in 1554, an edition that would greatly contribute to expand his diffusion all around Europe.

In the late 17th C./early 18th C., more philologically matured editions, with critical apparatus, commentaries, and prefatory pieces are published. Fundamental to Horace in Russia is the most authoritative of its times, the edition by André Dacier (1651-1722), published between 1681 and 1689, with many reissues and reimpressions in several parts of Europe. A few years later another Horatian edition furnished with commentaries was published by Noël Étienne Sanadon (1676-1733), a Jesuit priest and man of letters, who had his first critical edition Horace's complete works published in 1724,²⁷ with commentaries and a preface with issues regarding translation that will prove useful to the discussion presented in the following chapters. Both Frenchmen had a joint edition published first in Amsterdam (1735), which had great popularity and were used, possibly in its subsequent editions and reimpression, by most if not all of our Russian pioneers.²⁸

Disregarding the question, beyond the interests of this thesis, as to the exact editions used by each of them, the work by the two French philologists were the main and most authoritative access the Russians had in their appropriation of Horace, possibly from their very acquaintance with the poet, certainly to the most difficult questions they encountered in their

²⁶ Among which is the hugely influential edition of the poems ascribed to the 5th C. BC poet Anacreon of Teos (Paris, 1554), that came to be the most relevant of the prominent models for poetic emulation in classicist Russia.

²⁷ *Les Poesies d'Horace, traduites en Français, avec des remarques et des thess critiques*. Paris, 1724.

²⁸ *Oeuvres d'Horace, en Latin Traduites en François par M. Dacier et P. Sanadon, avec les remarques critiques historiques et geographiques de l'un et de l'autre, en huit tomes*. Amsterdam chez J. Wetstein et G. Smith, 1735. AP is contained in tome eight. Trediakovsky and Kantemir must have made use of it in their acquaintance with Horace, easily attested by the notes and paratextual information they provided in their translations, usually abridgements of the remarks provided by the Frenchmen. Cf. below, pp. XX. The association of the two authors in one single edition attests to the influence they exerted in early 18th C. philology in shaping the general comprehension of Horace.

translations, diffusion efforts, and in their own works. Trediakovsky is one of their foremost tributaries, mentioning both Frenchmen in his translation and notes to the AP, published in his 1753 Collected Works (SiP). Here they will be his scholarship models, above all due to the fact that Trediakovsky based his translation ideas on Sanadon's didactical, prosaic approach to the procedure, many times simply by directly translating some of his notes in the notes he himself provided to his rendering of the AP.²⁹

Kantemir in his translations of the Epistles is more straightforward when stating his scholarly models: he affirms to have taken directly from Dacier's edition, quoting from his commentaries and duly ascribing their provenance. Kantemir, as we shall see in chapter 4, provides, along with Dacier's commentaries, his own notes attached to his translation, in a didactic, formative approach, becoming a pioneer also in presenting his own interpretations and readings to more demanding issues of a text from Classical Antiquity. As for Lomonosov and Sumarokov, I could not find specific references in their work to these particular editions and shall leave this marginal question unaddressed. The fact is that Horace entered Russia via France not only through the editions, commentaries, reference notes, prefaces, discourses, and critical texts dedicated to him in that country, but also through the undeniable presence of this great master of median poetry as a foremost authority to the great poets who were, in the preceding two centuries, the main players in the expanding French literary field.

Useful facts on French 17th C. literary field

Apart from the editorial facts that helped form the literary background of the Russians, there were a few other questions in the French literary field that were important to the formation

²⁹ Trediakovsky does not duly cite the particular notes he copied from Sanadon in their contexts, but both Dacier and Sanadon are mentioned as references and authorities in the preface to SiP.

of Russian Letters: the long debate on the reception of the Classics, that culminated in the so-called *Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes*, and the weight placed on normative poetics, above all by the influence of *Le Legislateur du Parnasse Français*, Nicholás Boileau Despreaux and his *Art Poétique*.

17th C. France saw a movement that shook one of the pillars of contemporary literary practices and set several trends that would help shape literary French in the following centuries. It is a long discussion that started in the first decades of the century, and culminated in episodes that involved literates very relevant in their times, in sometimes bitter personal quarrels that fuelled the controversies to an anecdotal level.

Some suspicion against the face-value adoption of the Ancient Classics may be dated to the beginning of the century with, for example, the tendency established by François de Malherbe (1555-1628), that displayed and advocated for clarity and simplicity in opposition to the previous Renaissance practices adopted by Pierre de Ronsard (1524-1585) and the other poets that formed the *Pléiade*. The attacks on Ronsardian elocution touched the question of the excessive cult paid to the Ancients, especially in the enthusiasm displayed by the Renaissance poets with the most celebrated of Ancient Greek lyric poets: Pindar.³⁰ The break with the so-called Pindaric mystification, started consistently with Malherbe's works, represented especially by the derogatory *gallimatias*³¹, and taken up later by many other authors, were a first impulse toward the demands for good taste that would mark the aesthetic expectations of the following two centuries. By the end of the 17th C. this discussion had a culmination point in the outright rejection of classical antiquity as a relevant model for contemporary times,

³⁰ On the reception of Pindar in 18th C. Russia and a comprehensive background to his reception in France cf. Smolyarova, 2013. On the issue in France, cf. Adam, 1997.

³¹ Gallimatias: gibberish. Term popularised by Malherbe to refer especially to a poetic style that lacked precision, clarity and simplicity directed in some of his works to Ronsard.

opposing two champions from each field in what came to be known as the *Querelle des anciens et des modernes*.

This quarrel directly opposed the ancient and modern orientations in the personalities of Nicolas Boileau-Despreaux and Charles Perrault. It officially started in 1687, when Perrault read in an address to the *Académie Française* a poem he composed on the occasion of a full recovery of Louis XIV, a solemn ode to the King, *Le Siècle de Louis le Grand*, where he sets off to deconstruct the myth of the ancients by proclaiming that “they were men just like us”, and it is injustice not to compare “the century of Louis with the century of Augustus”. Soon after, Perrault would add this piece to his Parallel of the Ancients and Moderns (*Parallèle des Anciens et des Modernes en ce qui regarde les arts et les sciences*).

The blow received an answer two years later when two pieces were published by Boileau in one of his collected works³²: the Ode on the taking of Namur (*Ode sur la Prise de Namur*), prefaced by a Discourse on the Ode (*Discours sur l’Ode*), a brief supplementary piece to better situate the reader in the quarrel and more clearly consolidate the author’s own position in the debate. Pindar is the main defendant in the case, since the Theban author was the most attacked, not only in Perrault’s *Parallèles*, but also, as seen, all throughout the century, starting with the outright rejection of Ronsard and the poets of the French Renaissance. In this wise, one of the most important models for this first French generation, Pindar, with his obscure assessments, intricate syntax, and abrupt transitions felt into disfavour as his translations and imitations marked what the next generation, headed above all by Malherbe, saw it as bad taste and literary mumbo jumbo. The orientation for clarity, simplicity and metaphorical sobriety was set by this author of immense influence in France, and remained the foremost literary qualities expected for the new poets composing in the language.

³² *Ouvres Diverses*, 1694.

Boileau includes himself in this Malherbian tradition but is also an arduous enthusiast of the role played by Pindar. If on the one hand he will criticize Ronsardian poetry as immature, recognizing the Malherbian elocution as the state of the art in French poetry, he will also pay the utmost respect to the ancients and will devote special attention to advocating for Pindar as a model and an author to be held in the highest esteem in the long tradition any poet has to affiliate if he was to be considered a worthy poet, according to him. Boileau thus tries to synthesize the recently established and now unescapable authority of Malherbe, while trying to preserve the ancient authority of Pindar and, by extension, the classical antiquity he so diligently cultivated.

The features of clarity, simplicity, and taste were by then already incorporated in both Boileau's and Perrault's literary orientations. Their differences consisted above all in assessing the capacity the Classics had to say anything relevant to contemporary expectations and necessities, a time marked by the grandeur and pomp unlike anywhere else in Europe as that displayed in the court of Louis XIV. In his defence of Pindar, Boileau tries to assert the relevance of the Theban poet by composing an ode "in the manner of the Ancient dithyrambic poets", with "the most audacious figures", as he puts in his *Discours sur L'ode*, the polemical theoretical piece that introduces the *Ode sur la Prise de Namur*, his most direct attempt to imitate Pindar.³³ In it he also presents an argument every enthusiast of Pindar said at least once in their life to the "uninitiated": it is impossible to grasp the magnitude of such poet through translation; Pindar's very use of Doric Greek being the feature that puts a spell on so many students of the language. Boileau's principal intention was to try to represent to the best of his abilities the "wonderful places when the poet, to assert a spirit completely out of himself breaks

³³ Boileau, 1966, pp. 227-229.

sometimes the line of his discourse”. He advocates for the Pindaric “transport”, even if he has to go against “wise outbursts of rage by Malherbe”, as he will put a few lines below.

The attempt backfired, and the ode received harsh criticism and mockery in its reception. Boileau’s attempt to restore the prestige of Pindaric elocution was to many a vain attempt, whose central feature of lyric disorder would be felt in Russia, as we shall see below. But regarding the question of ancients and moderns, the case was still not closed. Boileau would still write twelve “Critical Reflections” (*Réflexions Critiques*) as a response to other two parallels written by Perrault, and here we see that the quarrel goes beyond the mere literary differences. It reveals a previous enmity with Charles’ brother Gilles Perrault, a physician that unsuccessfully treated a malady that plagued Boileau. The polemics started by Perrault added to the previous grudge between his brother and Boileau, being actually the first topic addressed in the first of the *Reflexions Critiques*. The others are a vindication of the authors proper, with Homer and Pindar receiving the greatest share of attention.

With this justification of Pindar through an ode addressed to the King, it is never too much to remember that this quarrel essentially had political motivations and were part of a quest for favour, present in the many spheres of influence that revolved around the Sun-King, in this case the *Academie Française*. This debasement of Antiquity advanced by Perrault served above all to praise the “great lights” this modern, powerful, kingdom promised, and thereby grant Perrault’s faction in the *Academie* the favour they needed from the king. In this wise, they were a milestone in the progressive loss of influence Ancient culture suffered in the ever-growing intellectual fields all throughout Europe in the next two (or three) centuries. It also revealed a dispute for power and favour from the Sun King, who had just entered the second half of his reign.

The querelle continued a few decades later, in the next episode involving André's wife, the great Anne Dacier, a philologist more accomplished than her husband and the foremost scholarly authority in the generation, responsible for establishing the most authoritative editions of Homer, with both the *Iliad* (1699) and the *Odyssey* (1708). No less important was her edition and commentaries of Anacreon, or rather, the *Anacreontics*, a collection composed between the 1st and 7th Cc. AD, attributed to the old poet of Teos (5th C. BC), and one of the most influential collections of the ancient canon that celebrated love, wine, and the fleeting condition of our impermanent lives. Whenever one of our Russian pioneers, most of them having little or no Greek,³⁴ wanted to have access to Homer or to the *Anacreontea*, the most imitated model of the 18th C. in the region, they would turn to Mme. Dacier's edition. Anne played a main role in this new episode of the *Querelle* after the publication of her Homer, having been attacked, in a less aggressive fashion by Houdar de la Motte.

In comparison with French letters, in Early Russia this quarrel did not manifest itself in the question whether the authority of Ancient Classics should be contested or not. In their perception, the Ancient Classics were a must, taken for granted in the formation of any competent poet, and their authority could not be contested, if a whole, Western, Classical tradition was to be implanted into a language that still lacked standardization, proper codification and stylistic differentiation. They were the reverential sources of the craft. Besides, the imposition of Imperial Augustan-like pomp in the court of Peter the Great needed some

³⁴ Of the authors studied here, Trediakovsky and Sumarokov are known to have the least some acquaintance with ancient Greek, but their knowledge of the language was intermediate, at best (cf. Drage, 1962, with a list of elementary mistakes committed by Trediakovsky in his SiP). Both try imitations of Pindar: Cf. Sumarokov's Ode 32 in Novikov's Edition (PSP, Tom 2, pg. 193), where one can find the remarkable polemical note addressed to Lomonosov, alleging that he had no Greek and, likely, had never read Pindar at all. Perhaps this was an overstatement, for Lomonosov knew Greek well enough to the point of translating the many passages of Greek authors he quotes in his 1747 *Rhetoric*, and of course, the *Anacreontic* poems that make up his great *Conversation with Anacreon* (1761). Kantemir was the first to translate the *Anacreontic* poems, in another ground-breaking project that sadly ended up completely forgotten and inconsequential (Cf. below, Chapter 4).

model displays of power and Ancient Rome was the main source of inspiration for their political and aesthetic purposes. In the letters they could not but be granted the reverence they were due in the formative moments of all western European Renaissances. The quarrels in the first generation of Russian poets were rather identified with discussions that took place decades before the *Querelle* of Boileau and Perrault. It was rather in the Malherbian demand for more clarity, simplicity, univocity against the deemed obscure, intricate, and excessively acute Ronsardian poetry. When Sumarokov attacks Lomonosov in all his possible incoherencies, logical inconsistencies, imagistic absurdities, obscure assessments and so on, as displayed in his Critique to the Ode (*Kritika k Odu*),³⁵ it is in his “baroqueness” and lack of tune with the principal trends of Enlightenment.³⁶

Boileau continued the line of “good-taste” poetry started by Malherbe, while maintaining the reverence the ancients, especially to the most abstruse authors such as Pindar. His attempt at synthesis of these apparently contradictory trends and well-established authority in the first decades of 18th C. France transported to Russia these demands for good taste and the full respect paid for the ancients not entirely shared by Malherbe and the following generations that unescapably fell under the influence of his powerful poetry.³⁷

Boileau’s main influence, naturally, was exerted through his *Art Poétique*, the gold standard for poetic normatisation at the time. An actualization and development of Horace’s

³⁵ *Kritika na Odu*, an exhaustive analysis of Lomonosov’s 1747 Ode on Elizabeth Petrovna’s Ascension to the throne, is one of Sumarokov’s clearest theoretical assessments of his aesthetic positions, in opposition to Lomonosov’s poetical practices. Cf. PSVS Tome 10, pg. 77.

³⁶ The discussion on a Russian baroque culture is well expounded in Bucsela, 1972. I do not adopt the term as operationally useful for my purposes since it only started as a historiographical context in late-19th C. and was altogether ignored by 18th C. writers. For a thorough problematization of the term, cf. the works by Professor João Adolfo Hansen, especially his monumental work on the 17th C. Brazilian poet Gregório de Matos Guerra (Hansen, 2004). Cf. also Hansen, 2001.

³⁷ To take an example, I would argue that the comprehension of Pindar in classicist Russia was filtered by Boileau, above all with in his defence of the Theban poet in the *Querelle* (*Discours sur l’ode*; *Ode sur la prise de Namur*; the extracts in the *Art Poétique* that touch the Pindaric mode). It is certainly not a simple question, especially if one takes into account the German influence on Lomonosov, but it is clear that the Frenchman played no minor role in it.

AP to times more concerned with standardizations and correctness, written according to a general European trend of reconceptualizing the AP that started in the beginning of the 16th C. in a variety of forms and languages.³⁸ Written in a polemical verve that could serve as model to foreign literary quarrels, it was a very imposing text for individuals eager for being the first and true founders of the letters of this exceedingly proud Empire.

When it comes to this first generation, Boileau's *Art Poétique* was one of the most important texts for Russian Classicism. Its influence was inescapable in the several literary quarrels and discussions that made up the bulk of the critical reflections expressed by this first generation of Russian poets. Considering the demands for good taste, the establishment of a canon of authorities and the correction and standardization of this new literary language, all made use of Boileau as an orienting principle in a moment when poetry in Russian was undergoing the process of establishing its poetic forms, officially established in Lomonosov's metrical propositions of 1739. Such influence is seen already in Trediakovsky's *New and Brief Method of Russian Versification* (1735), especially if we consider the poems appended, written in the new forms proposed by the pioneer, such as the *Epistle from Russian Poetry to Apollo*, an example of this anxiety for the inclusion of the new poetic language (and its author!) in the canon of already established poetic authorities from the many languages that made up Western tradition.³⁹

³⁸ For an extensive overview of the reception of the AP, cf. Ferriss-Hill, 2019, pg. 251ff.

³⁹ The *Epistle from Russian Language to Apollo* (*Epistola ot Rossiiskii Poetii k Apollinu*) included among the poetic examples of the foundational 1735 *New and Brief Method* was one among the many examples of different genres practiced in the Western European poetic traditions introduced by Trediakovsky as a novelty in the new Russian literature. It consisted in a letter written in prosopopoeia by the budding Russian poetry to the god of the muses listing its several attributes in comparison with a catalogue of its "older sisters", the many languages that formed the Western canon (and some other Eastern mentions, such as Turkish, Persian and Indian poetries), and its respective authors, to conclude with the question: am I the only one left behind? The poem, written in the trochaic hexameter proposed in the method, was announced by its author as "possibly the first epistle composed in Russian". It is a very clear example of the expectations and literary orientations of these first Russian pioneers. Trediakovsky, 1963, pp. 390-395.

But the most important Russian imitator of the *Art Poétique* was Sumarokov with his Epistle II, On Composition of Verses (*O Stikhotvorstve*), which for a brief time bestowed upon its author the much coveted title of Legislator of the Russian Parnassus. It was the last major manifestation of this prescriptive didactical poetry in Russia and consolidated Sumarokov's authority as a literary model, until the advent of Pushkin. In the manner of an abridgement the *Art Poétique*, the Second Epistle contained a theory on clarity, a catalogue of authorities to imitate, the genres in which poetry was to be effected and how to write them, and polemical portions addressed against competitors in the literary field deemed harmful to the good practices of the language. In this epistle, Trediakovsky receives his first devastating criticism, the first of many he would endure for the rest of his biological and much of his posthumous life. Along with the first, this second letter was a pivotal moment for the literary field of the first generation, establishing the central tenets of poetical practice in the period, lasting for at least the next two poetic generations in the history of Russian literature. Its views on imitation and translation are analysed in Chapter II.

Boileau's *Art Poétique* was the principal model to early Russian Classicism and through these lenses the main writers in this first generation, but of course, it was in itself an imitation of Horace's AP, and any literary background could not have one without the other. As we shall see in the next chapters, Horace was always on the background of any literary discussion and translations of his most didactic works present in the literary endeavours of all the poets in the first generation. This generation, however, was not the first one in Russian lands to be acquainted with Ancient Rome and Latin. The schools where most of its authors had their elementary formation provided their first Latin and, certainly, their first contact with Horace. Therefore, I think it might be useful to provide an outlook on the Horatian reception in Russia before proceeding to the next chapter.

ii Backgrounds to the Reception of Horace in in Russia

In Eastern Europe, Horace and Latinity as a whole also had diligent, albeit modest cultivators before Peter, the Great. It was in the 17th C. that Russia saw for the first time any relevant portion of texts written in Latin in her lands.⁴⁰ But the reception of Horace in Russia must be traced back to the only region where Latinity and Catholic practices of education had penetrated and modestly flourished: Ruthenia.

Part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth until mid-17th C., Ruthenia still did not belong to Muscovy, and would remain as such until the 1650's when the Eastern *de-facto* republic started to decline. In brief, in 1648 there took place a calamitous insurrection for the Commonwealth, promoted by the Zaporozhian Host of Cossacks in the lower Dniepr river, known in Polish history as the Deluge, and as the Khmelnitsky Rebellion according to Ukrainian national consciousness. These lands would fall into the suzerainty of Muscovy, coreligionists and seat of the principal ecclesiastical authority of the greater part of the population, when was signed the Treaty of Pereyaslav (1654), after Bogdan Khmelnitsky pledged allegiance to Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich Romanov, thereby receiving the title of Hetman of the then officially established polity of the Zaporozhian Host.

Their former lords, the Poles, had by then a fully developed literature, with a renaissance movement that happened concomitantly and with the same impetus as in France and England, for example. The significant collection of texts, produced both in Latin and in vernacular, revealed authors that would not fare any worse than their Western counterparts. From Bernard of Ljubin (1465-1529), the first ever to write in Polish vernacular, to Mikolaj Rej (1505-1569), first Polish satirist who explored the lower elocutionary levels of the language, these authors made full use of the elocutionary possibilities of vernacular poetry and

⁴⁰ Latin language and Roman culture were hardly found in Muscovy before the 18th C. For an account of the brief and paltry production of Latin poetry in Russia cf. Liburkin, 2000.

prose, making Polish the first true authoritative modern Slavic vernacular, preceding in a few decades the man who is sometimes claimed to be “the greatest Slavic poet until the 19th C”, Jan Kochanowski (1530-1584).⁴¹

The quality of this strong, fully matured language was equalled in many texts by authors who wrote partially or exclusively in Latin. Here, Maciej Kazimierz Sarbiewski (1595-1640) must be mentioned for perhaps he was the last truly widely read and acclaimed neo-Latin poet, with a readership that extended from England to Ruthenia.⁴² A Jesuit priest who lived the ideological heyday of his order, Sarbiewski produced lyrical poetry, epigrams, epodes, and would receive for his accomplishments epithets such as the Sarmatian Horace, or more synthetically, the Christian Horace. His exquisite amalgamation of Christianity and Classical Antiquity consolidated him as the principal contemporary literary authority to be emulated by all those who dared to compose poetry in the old language, and this is especially true when it comes to our region of interest.

The *de facto* capital of Ruthenia was Kiev, the mother of all Russian cities, and in the years it was under Polish domination,⁴³ it was a centre in which different cultures and religions converged and, many times, clashed. Eastern Orthodox since the conversion of Rus to Christianity in 988, but since the 14th C. under the rule of a Catholic kingdom that progressively expanded its influence, the region received an influx of Catholicism that eventually led to a split in the Metropolis of Kiev, when some eparchies entered in communion with Rome, ratified in the Union of Brest (1595-1596). The members of this newly formed autocephalous Church came to be pejoratively known as Uniates (*Uniaty*), and the Catholic church began to

⁴¹ BARANCZAK; HEANEY, 1995. pp. vii.

⁴² The first translation in England of Sarbiewski's works date from the 16th C.

⁴³ The region of XX was annexed by the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in XXXX,

exert an influence that startled the Orthodox majority of the region, weighting into the events that would lead to the Khmelnitsky Rebellion in the mid-century.

This influence was also exerted by the increasingly efficient educational and evangelical methods developed and employed by the Society of Jesus, founded in 1540. The evangelization impetus of these Christian brothers-in-arms to spread Catholicism from Brazil to Japan became in the 17th C. an essential weapon for Catholic Rome to counter the Reformation in the upheaval that would ravage Western-Europe all throughout the century. With the need to advance Catholic doctrine in an increasingly efficient and massified way, the Jesuits instituted organized teaching material and a program of studies that were to be one of the first effective attempts of a truly massified universal education. The *Ratio Studiorum* was an extremely consequential program that still remains influent in some Catholic-oriented schools. Starting with the rudiments of grammar up to the last levels of Theology, the program was used to orient thousands of collegia all over Europe.

The Jesuits have their importance, in addition to the efficiency of their evangelical methods, the concept of Latinity as a pivotal tenet to their ideology: the assiduous cultivation of Latin language through the reading, memorizing, imitating of the numerous great ancient authorities of Classical Latin. The promotion of the Ancient Roman culture (and Greek, for that matter, albeit less extensively) to an almost equal share of reverence as the Scriptures and the Fathers and Doctors of the Church was one of biggest contributions of Jesuitism to the upkeep of the Republic of Letters so zealously cared for by the likes of Erasmus and other great humanists.

Having Poland as the base for the diffusion of Catholicism to the easternmost regions of Europe, the Jesuits increasingly marked presence in Ruthenia, along with their Latin ideology. This moved a few Orthodox clergymen to adopt educational strategies similar to that

of their Catholic counterparts, in a movement that was equally seen with suspicion by the intellectual authorities of Muscovy, as was defended and cared for in the Ruthenian intellectual milieu, a country much more prone to attuning with the Polish sphere of influence, both in religion and in the cultivation of Latin. The central school of Ruthenia was the Brotherhood Monastery (*Bratsky Monastyr*) who had Petro Mohyla as the main initiator of an educational reform that sought to vie with the Jesuit colleges evermore abundant in Poland. In such an endeavour he adopted virtually the same guidelines as the Jesuits for a school to be established in the grounds of the monastery. In 1615 a school was founded there, that two decades later would become a college modelled after the guidelines set by the *Ratio Studiorum*. The school took from the Jesuits not only in the matter of hierarchies and methodology, but also the very medium the Catholics used to propagate their faith: Latin language.

The College of the Kievan Brotherhood was the first place to offer higher education in Western terms in the lands of Ruthenia, and soon after, to the greater realm of Russia in a movement that foreshadows the westernizing wave brought about by Peter's reforms. It remained for almost the whole century the only place a schoolboy could learn Latin and receive a formation in its greatest authors, by reading, memorizing, and imitating them. Latinity finally arrived in these Eastern-Slavic lands and would produce a modest, but dedicated harvest of neo-Latin compositions. Like their Jesuit counterparts, Mohyla's College offered the courses of grammar, poetics, rhetoric, and philosophy. Unlike the western colleges guided by the *Ratio*, that demanded from the student the rudiments of Latin grammar upon admission, it provided extra elementary courses for those who had no experience whatsoever with the language, which made up the entire student corpus.

The institution remained a college until 1658, when it received the authorization to teach theology, thereby being turned into an academy, the Academy of Kiev. This is the parent institution of today's National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy (NaUKMA), officially re-

established after the collapse of the Soviet Union, and it played a very important role in Russia's cultural development as a whole.

After the incorporation of Ruthenia to Muscovy, the school consistently provided manpower to its new overlords, through the transfer of several lecturers and alumni from the school, representing a significant factor in the incorporation of Western culture into the court of Alexei Romanov.⁴⁴ They would take to Moscow the very suspicious concept of *latinstvo* in a moment of painful religious struggle in the realm, at the height of the crisis that would precipitate the schism of the Russian Orthodox Church, the *Raskol*. A few decades later, in the 1680's another similar institution would be founded in Moscow, organised practically according to the same principles as the Academy of Kiev. With the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy, founded by the Greek Likhud brothers, the study of Latin was roughly established in Moscow and would in its own way serve to provide the rudiments to some of the main actors in this thesis.⁴⁵

The adoption of Jesuit education by Petro Mohyla as an Orthodox response to the growing Catholic influence in the region, helped the modernization process of Russia simply by being the oldest most authoritative educational institution in the region. To mention an example of its local influence, when Lomonosov finished in [three] years the whole 10-year curriculum set by the Slav-Greek-Latin Academy, his first decision was to quench his thirst for knowledge in the Academy of Kiev, where he spent six months in 1737, before being transferred to the Academy of Sciences, and subsequently to Germany. His dissatisfaction with the "scholastic methods of the institution", as Soviet biographers put,⁴⁶ reveal on the one hand its inadequacy to be an educational institution that provided the technical knowledge needed

⁴⁴ Alexei Fyodorovich Romanov (1629-1676): second monarch of the Romanov dynasty, father to Peter the Great.

⁴⁵ For an account of the establishment and some of the courses expounded in the Academy, especially the one on Rhetoric, cf. Chrissidis (2015).

⁴⁶ Fiodorov, Pavlova, 1987.

by the new bureaucratic and military apparatus instituted by Peter the Great (and by the intellectual needs of Lomonosov), but also the essential role displayed by Jesuitic Latinity in its core. Be that as it may, the polymath acquired there and in the SLG Academy, his first school, the knowledge of Ancient Classics and Fathers of the Church that would help form his poetical genius and his philological expertise. Not to mention his Latin, that would be a key element in his education in the German universities he attended and also in compositions of lesser relevance such as the speech to Elizabeth Petrovna written in 1749.⁴⁷ Lomonosov would have the later influences of German poetry and rhetoric, but it is undeniable that these institutions provided him with the foundations to his knowledge in the realm of letters.

The fundamental role these two institutions played in the formation of these first literates, reveals a link between this “revolutionary” generation and this moment of proto-classicism in Russia. It, therefore, might be useful for the purposes of this thesis to dedicate a few words on the structure of the Academy of Kiev, paying particular attention to their course of Poetics. This course provides a very interesting account of how Latin poetry was taught there, some insights on one of the most important personalities in the reshaping of Russian culture during the Petrine era, Feofan Prokopovich. Last but not least, it will serve to provide an account of the pre-history of the reception of Horace in Russia.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ A panegyric speech originally composed by Lomonosov in Russian and subsequently translated to Latin by himself: *Panegyricus Elisabethae Augustae Russiarum Imperatrici Patrio Sermone Dictus Orante Michaelae Lomonosow. Latine Redditus eodem Auctorem*. Lomonosov PSS. 8. pp. 257-272.

⁴⁸ I chose the Academy of Kiev due to its greater relevance in the educational scenario of the Petrine Era. The SGL Academy was modelled in similar fashion and, after the 1700`s, may be taken as roughly a reproduction of its Ukrainian counterpart. It also does not have its course on poetics as extensively studied as the one in the Academy of Kiev. For more information of the Academy, paying particular attention to its course of rhetoric, cf. Chrissidis, 2015.

iii. Poetry in the Academy of Kiev

The Academy was organized in such a way as to rotate its staff members through the different courses it provided. A professor teaching poetics in one year, would teach rhetoric in the next and so on. Each professor was expected to write a manual or guide to be used in his classes each year. This demand was a formative element for the very professionals teaching their respective courses, and certainly served to consolidate the knowledge and teaching skills of each of them, usually former alumni from the same institution. Luckily, the course of poetics preserved the best part of these manuals and notebooks composed in the Academy, offering an extensive material to study the Ruthenian acquaintance with Classical Antiquity. The extant corpus contains about 30 exemplars, with the oldest dating from 1637, and the newest, from 1746.⁴⁹ The most famous of these manuals and the only ever to receive a critical edition in its original Latin is the one written in 1705 by Feofan Prokopovich, one of its alumni, and, after his trip to Italy, one of the main professors of the institution.⁵⁰ The cleric would still write a manual on Rhetoric for the course he would lecture in the following year.⁵¹

The main source for the organization of these manuals were the Jesuits.⁵² Even though the teaching of poetics was not specified in the *Ratio* as to what specific manuals were to be used, poetry was an essential element in the cultivation of the Humanities in their worldview. The Jesuits certainly revered this art, having produced high-level Neo-Latin works and a sophisticated theoretical basis for the subject. The aforementioned Maciej Sarbiewski is the

⁴⁹ They can be found today in National Library of Kiev. All of them, except for Prokopovich's await a critical edition and their study is still restricted to scholarship produced in Ukrainian, with the valuable exception of the work of Italian professor Giovanna Siedina. cf. Siedina, 2014.

⁵⁰ Edited and translated by Eremin, 1966, pp. 227-455. The manual received an edition as well in late 18th C. by Novikov (1786). Another one was edited (*Hortus Poeticus*, by Mitrophan Dovhalevs'kyi, 1736) but is only available in translation to Ukrainian. The remaining are kept in their manuscript version in the National Library of Ukraine and await a proper edition.

⁵¹ *De Arte Rhetorica Libri X*. A recent translation to Russian is easily available (Prokopovich, Stratanovski, 2020). The original Latin version is more difficult to access, but information regarding editions and other relevant data can be also be found in Kibalnik, 1983.

⁵² Cf. Siedina, 2014, pp. 1-21.

most luminous example, considering both his poetical output and his theoretical works on poetry. And they certainly produced elementary material on the subject, the most influential of which, at least in Eastern Europe, were the Three Books of Poetical Institutions (*Poeticarum Institutionum L.III*), written by the German priest Jakob Spanmüller, better known by the latinized name Jacobus Pontanus.⁵³ Its influence was substantial all over Eastern Europe and Kiev was no exception. All the Kievan methods adopt its views on what poetry is, or should be, its organizational strategies, the corpus that will guide the composition of their own poems, and, of course, its language.

Highly utilitarian, minutely prescriptive, synthesising the latest trends of the poetry of its time and ideology, the Institutes were a typical Jesuit manual. Naturally, it was written according to the Counter-Reformation ends assigned to poetry, and more specifically to Neo-Latin poetry, by then an activity still cultivated, based essentially on the imitation of the great authorities of classical tradition. For the poet, in this and every other preromantic conception, is essentially an imitator, following the Aristotelian concept of *mimesis*, understood as someone who “makes or does something in resemblance to something else”.⁵⁴ Pontanus argues for the poet’s necessity to imitate in the same way as Aristotle does in the Poetics, that is, as an imitator of human actions, a creator of narratives that are sewn together by the rules of verisimilitude and necessity.

This Aristotelian perspective is complemented by another notion of imitation: the inspiration offered by a given author considered exemplary. In this case, imitation is the act “by which, through diligent measure, we can become similar, or even more distinguished, to a good and prominent poet, following all his virtues”, as put in chapter 10.⁵⁵ In order to become

⁵³ Pontanus, 1600.

⁵⁴ LUCAS, 1968, pg. 83.

⁵⁵ “*Alteram qua impellimur cum diligenti ratione, ut alicuius boni, et praestantis poetae, similes secundum omnes eius virtutes, aut saltem ingeniores esse possimus.*” PONTANUS, 1600, pg. 28.

a decent poet one has to read, memorize, and incorporate the works of the great poetic authorities of old before writing their own. In order to achieve that, the novice needs to practice, in the several exercises also offered by the tradition. To write a poem, then, means to clearly have in mind what specific literary genre it will be affiliated to and to have a thorough acquaintance with the literary authority that “presides over” the chosen genre. Thus, if one is to write comedy, Plautus will be the author of choice, if epic poetry, Virgil and Homer, if lyric poetry, there is no better choice than Horace.

The practice is essentially the one recommended to orators, present in passages like Cicero’s *De Oratore* (II.88-97) and in Book 10 of Quintilian’s *Institutions*. The imitation of esteemed poetic works is the same principle prescribed by these egregious masters of oratory, however in the same way as they admonish against the uncritical appropriation of everything an orator has to offer as a model, in poetry imitation should be carried out parsimoniously as well. Against the worst vice a poet might incur while imitating the greatest, Horace is called upon. The Jesuit refers to the much-quoted passage in Ep. 1.19, vv. 19-20, against servile poets: “you imitators, slavish herd, how often your to-do has raised my bile, or else my laughter!”.⁵⁶ To Pontanus, this means to take everything indistinctly from the model, be it a noble quality, or a vice. If a poet does that, he will incur into “superstition and stupidity”.⁵⁷

To offer an overview of its general structure, the manual is divided in three books, separated in two larger sections: Book 1, comprising the first section, presents the general principles of the subject, containing a brief history, the uses, the benefits of the art, as well as the definition of its mimetic nature, explanations on the different stylistic approaches, and a description of several exercises to the full command of the discipline. The second section (Books 2 and 3) explains how to write poems in each particular genre, according to their matter,

⁵⁶ MACLEOD, 1986, pg. 55.

⁵⁷ Pontanus, 1600.

form, and occasion. It is, in other words, a section on “applied poetics”, the practical embodiment of the principles displayed in the first section. Book 2 covers epic, dramatic and lyric poetry, and dedicates one paragraph to satire. Book 3 is entirely devoted to epigrammatic poetry, placing great importance on the concept of *acumen*, or *pointe*, or the metaphor that brings together two distant concepts, translated by English grammarians and prescriptivists of the 16th C. as wit.⁵⁸

This twofold division in theoretical and applied poetics, the main theoretical and prescriptive aspects to poetry, the thorough subdivision in genres, all of it was taken up by the Kievans in their manuals. All of them present this partition, which reflects the influence of Pontanus and other Jesuit prescriptivists.⁵⁹ The most famous Kievan textbook to inherit this theoretical approach was Feofan Prokopovich’s “Three Books on the Art of Poetry for the Use and Instruction of the Industrious Ruthenian Youth”,⁶⁰ from 1705, a manual that represented a turning point on the teaching of Latin Jesuit-derived poetics, in the institution. Tributary not only of Pontanus’ manual, but also informed by the Poetics of Scaliger, Prokopovitch’s Art of Poetry offers a new approach to the teaching of poetry in the Academy of Kiev, being credited with introducing several innovations to these manuals, chiefly through the adoption of exercises such as the *progymnasmata*, especially from those the Greek grammarian Aphthonius of Antioch (4th C. AD).⁶¹

The manual offers the same twofold division between theoretical and applied poetics as the other methods but is more extensive in the historical treatment of its subject (Chapter 1), offering, along with its justifications, definitions of nature, subjects, ends (Chapter 2), important considerations on the two types of imitation mentioned above, plus the several types

⁵⁸ For a treatment of the concept of wit, as translation of the concept of *acumen*, cf. Silveiras, 2018.

⁵⁹ Siedina, 2016.

⁶⁰ *De Arte Poetica Libri III ad Usum et Institutionem Studiosae Juventutis Roxolanae*.

⁶¹ Cf. Siedina, 2014, pp. 47-48. Prokopovich mentions Aphthonius’ *Progymnasmata*, indicating its source, but does not include them all, and does not present them in the same order as the original.

of exercises to develop the craft. The other two books are on the so-called applied poetics: Book 2 deals with the genres of epic (chapters 1-9), and, less extensively, tragedy, comedy, and tragicomedy (chapters 10-11). It offers specific treatment of “virtues” characteristic not of the elevated, high-elocution genres of epic and tragedy, but of poetry in general, such as amplification, pathos, and decorum (chapter 8). Book 3 is mainly about low-elocutionary poetry, divided into bucolics, satire, elegy, lyric and, occupying some three fourths of the book, epigrammatic poetry, divided into epigram and epitaph. The emphasis placed upon epigrammatic poetry is another feature shared with Pontanus’ manual and may reveal a preference by the Jesuitic tradition for the genre.⁶²

Another very important aspect mentioned in Pokopovich’s manual, to which he dedicates an entire chapter, consists in a guide to the imitation of well-established literary authorities. In Chapter 9 of the first part of his manual, Prokopovich distinguishes between two different concepts of imitation, the first being the very nature of the poetic practice: the imitation of human actions as taught by Aristotle, having also the name of poetic fiction (*effictio poetica*) and treated in Chapter 3 of the first part of the manual. The second type, on the other hand, is the “diligent dedication and attention given to the reading of authors, by which we set out to become similar to a given prominent author.”⁶³ In other words, it is the full acquaintance through the arduous reading of a model that will result in the production of a text similar in nature, but appropriated to the designs of the new author and transfigured into a new text that eventually may prove to become a model. In this chapter, Prokopovich provides a list

⁶² The epigram was a very useful tool to study another indispensable concept to the poetry of the times: wit, or *pointe*, or acumen. Both manuals present their own theories on the subject (Prokopovich presents it in Chapter 6: On the argute closure of the epigram (*De Arguta Clausula Epigrammatis*), and the Jesuits have their most important production on the subject in the works of Maciej Sarbiewski, who wrote a book of epigrams and a theory of *pointe*. Cf. Lachmann, 1990; Sydor, 2005; Fullenwider, 1984.

⁶³ *diligens studium et operam lectioni auctorum dandam, quae scilicet praestantis alicuius poetae similes studemus evadere*. EREMIN, 1966, pg. 269.

of the most important approaches when practicing this literary procedure with eight pieces of advice and a few examples illustrating these approaches.

The first and foremost practice in imitating is, naturally, the thorough and diligent reading of the authors imitated: “No one can make perfect poetry who is not acquainted at length with the poets to be read.”⁶⁴ The assiduous and detailed reading is a pre-requisite in the formation of any poet. This is what will provide the *copia*, the variety that will inform and establish his repertoire to produce a compelling poem. This diligent reading must be structured according to the genre in which the new poet wishes to produce his poem. To seek for the most distinguished poet in each genre is the second piece of advice Prokopovich offers in this section. Here, it is offered a list of all the authors to be read in the Latin canon, duly separated in their respective genres: Virgil in the Epic, Plautus and Terentius in Comedy, Propertius and Ovid in the Elegy, Persius, Juvenal and Horace in Satire, Horace in Lyric poetry, and Martial in the Epigram.

Next Prokopovich admonishes the student not to read carelessly or negligently, but as attentively as possible. The text needs to be read many times until the student is familiarized enough as to keep it entirely in his memory. Proceeding in this way, the student will have incorporated the style of the imitated author like a seed through which a similar piece of writing will flourish anew. Memorization was an essential element in ancient education, extensively discussed and theorized by the most famous ancient Rhetoricians. Prokopovich does not offer any specific technique of practice to the absorption of a text besides a studious and attentive reading, but in his 10 books on the Art of Rhetoric, lectured one year later, he does.⁶⁵ Its last book is devoted to Memory and Pronunciation and here one can find the old approach to memory as a particular concrete place, with the things to be memorized arranged throughout

⁶⁴ Ibid. pg. 270.

⁶⁵ Prokopovich, 2020, pp. 443-447.

this place and represented with a corresponding associative image. This is Quintilian's "palace of memory", as described in IO 11.2, and already present as a method of memorisation almost two centuries earlier in the *Rhetorica ad Herennius* (3.16-24). Pokopovich must have had in mind these exercises for memorization of poetic texts as well.

However, the student must pay attention not to imitate his chosen author in every single detail. This is the next point Prokopovich will address: The student must not be a *superstitious* imitator, that is, someone who copies even the most insignificant details, that may sometimes be faulty. *Quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus*; sometimes good Homer dozes off and the student will not want to imitate him when he does. The Ruthenian will quote from the AP. 359, adding that Horace calls the types who do that *servum pecus*, the servile herd "that breathes only through someone else's wind, all hanging anxious from someone else's work."⁶⁶ Many believe to be new Virgils only because they start and finish their sentences with the same expressions used by the Mantuan that will only, he adds, make the reader sick. Quintilian is here remembered, in his admonition that the new author will not automatically become a Cicero simply because his sentences end in *esse videatur*.⁶⁷

Next, Prokopovich admonishes the student to observe what are the most outstanding aspects in each author. One has to observe how the author's sentences are effected, how they fit to the requirements of the genre, how ingenious his invention is in selecting the themes, how well-arranged the parts of his work, how admirably they furnish their works with tropes and figures. Since the main task of the poet is to please his reader, Prokopovich asserts that it is

⁶⁶ For *sometimes good Homer dozes off*, and these are called rightly so by Horace 'servile herd' in his *Ars Poetica*, indeed those who breathe only through someone else's wind, all hanging anxious from someone else's work. (Nam '*Quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus*', et hos iure merito Horatius libro de Arte Poetica appellat *servum pecus*, quippe qui aliena tantum spirent anima et ab alienis inventis, veluti ab uncis, toti anxii dependeant.) Ibid. pg. 270. Note that Prokopovich misquotes *servum pecus* attributing it to the AP. The slur belongs in Ep. I.19, v. 19.

⁶⁷ *Institutio Oratoria* 10.2.18.

through variety that he will manage to attain this objective. “Variety is the mother of delight”,⁶⁸ and so a series of characteristics are adduced to describe the principal qualities of an authoritative text, such as movement, weight of the words, their selection, quality, elegance, brightness, appropriateness, smoothness, fluidity and so on, qualities that every author fit for making up a canon has to present.

One of the greatest innovations of Prokopovich’s manual is that it introduces into Kievan education a systematic exposition of poetic exercises, taken from the tradition of *progymnasmata*, especially those proposed by Aphthonius of Antioch, in the 4th C. AD. A thorough description of each exercise is carried out in the 5th Chapter of his manual, but here, in the next piece of advice for a good imitation, Prokopovich will insist on the necessity of a correct poetic practice. Constructing a plot similar to that of the passage to be imitated, after careful readings and considerations, is the type of exercise chosen here. Prokopovich considers this to be the most useful and effective exercise to create a good poem, which if does not guarantee the creation of a new Virgil, something conceded to very few people, it will certainly contribute to form a competent poet.

However, the teacher is adamant insisting that the student do not incur into plagiarism. One should not simply transfer their narratives or sentences, for this is only allowed when one is creating parody. “Imitation, therefore, lies in certain disposition of our minds to conform with an acclaimed author, in such a way that, even though we take nothing specifically from him, our text resemble the model, so similar is our style to theirs.” The examples of 16th C. authors Christophe de Longueil, one of the most famous imitators of Cicero,⁶⁹ and Jacopo

⁶⁸ *Deinde omnis delectationis mater varietas notanda est.* Ibid, 270.

⁶⁹ Christophe de Longueil (1488-1522): Brabantine humanist, adept of the “literary sect” of the Ciceronians: Authors who defended the strict imitation of Cicero for their neo-Latin productions, excluding any utterance in Latin that had not been pronounced before by Cicero. This group would come to be mocked by Erasmus in his dialogue *Ciceronianus* (1528).

Sannazaro,⁷⁰ who according to Prokopovich sounds like Virgil himself, are two examples of authors who incur in this practice.

However, one can even use the same structures as the model or even borrow some expressions, as long as it strives to present the matter more beautifully than the model. Virgil, for instance, overcame Homer in the description of the shield of Aeneas, for the former would have represented the image of the word in general, without anything to do with the plot of the Iliad or Achilles' particularities, whereas Aeneas' shield represents only things that are particular to Aeneas, all the future events that would be consummated in the future generation of the Aeneads or the Romans. The other case of successful emulation is Tasso with his *Jerusalem Delivered*. Tasso has overcome Virgil's description of the capture and destruction of Troy in the scenes where Jerusalem is taken (Canto 18, 92-96). It is very interesting to note that when the five strophes of Tasso are reproduced, it is not in their original Italian but in a Polish translation, carried out by Piotr Kochanowski (1566-1620), another great name of the Polish Renaissance, renowned for having produced the greatest translations of his times.⁷¹ Polish was certainly a language more accessible than Italian to the students attending Prokopovich's course at the AKM and by presenting Tasso's great work in Kochanowski's translation he introduced a model authoritatively rendered in the most prestigious and accessible cultural language of his region.

With this account on emulation, Prokopovich finishes his prescriptions on poetic imitation in a doctrine, as we shall see, not much different from the ideas present in the subsequent authors, the poetry pioneers of the new language founded by Peter the Great, in what is usually called the first generation.

⁷⁰ Jacopo Sannazaro (1458 – 1530): Neapolitan humanist, writer, among several other poetic works, of *Arcadia* (1489) and the *Eclogae Piscatoriae* (1526), pastoral works heavily influenced by Virgil's *Bucolics*.

⁷¹ Piotr Kochanowski (1566-1620): Poet, nephew of the poet Jan Kochanowski, one of the pioneers in the use of the *ottava rima* in Polish, translator of *Gierusalemme Liberata* and *Orlando Furioso*.

Horace is prevalent among the authors quoted in Book 1 and is central to the theoretical basis adopted all throughout the manual. Both his *Ars Poetica* and his “Literary Epistles” abound in citations that effectively illustrate many concepts presented in this first section. Horace is mentioned right in Prokopovich’s preface (on the account of his own attempt to be brief in his endeavour, quoting *AP* 335-7). In Book 1, Chapter 1, Prokopovich quotes Odes 4.9 vv. 25-8 on the power of poetry to immortalize men and deeds, without which they would be relegated to oblivion.⁷² The next chapter, more concerned with the fundamentals of the art, begins with a very pressing issue for the Kievans and the Jesuit prescribers: the role of nature in the formation of the poet and its interplay with the possibilities of the *ars*, or the collection of precepts and models through the reading of which one becomes a poet informed in the tradition. The famous passage of the *AP* 409-11⁷³ (“For my part, I do not see what avail is study, when not enriched by Nature’s vein, or native wit, if untrained; so truly does each claim the other’s aid, and make with it a friendly league”⁷⁴) is mentioned in the plea for the total equilibrium between the two factors, granting the necessity of the manual currently presented.

The other manuals had the same preoccupations regarding these two factors, always placing the discussion between Nature vs. Art in their manuals. Art being *techne*, craft, skill developed and learned through the study of authoritative models, implied a set of organizational rules offered by the best craftsmen in a given tradition. Nature, on the other hand, and here is situated the ancient concept of genius, or *ingenium*, played in their worldview perhaps the most important role in the formation of a poet, usually being illustrated by the aphorism often attributed to Cicero, but possibly coined in first centuries of the Christian era:

⁷² Lomonosov will quote in his own translation the same Horatian passage to close one of his most important philological works, the *Preface to the use of Ecclesiastical books in Russian language*.

⁷³ Prokopovich mistakenly indicates the verse of the quotation, placing it in vv. 400ff. Eremin, 1966, pg. 237.

⁷⁴ FAIRCLOUGH, 2005, pg. 485.

*nascuntur poetae, oratores fiunt.*⁷⁵ The equality between art and natural ability in the Horatian verses served in a way to appease this strict norm, justifying the necessities of an art.⁷⁶

Horace is also quoted when it comes to assigning the ends and objectives of poetry. The no less famous verse 333 in the AP, “poets aim either to benefit or to amuse”⁷⁷, is the motto chosen not only by Prokopovich, but by most of the preceptors in the Academy of Kiev. The Horatian maxim, usually accompanied by the Ciceronian triad of the *movere, delectare, docere*, assigned to oratory, represented the main reason to study the art of poetry. These utilitarian ends underscored the fundamental principle of the Academy of Kiev which was “the education of pious men, by asserting ethical values, encouraging virtue and discouraging vice.”⁷⁸ And perhaps the most important poetical text in this program of studies was the AP, which along with the other Horace’s “literary” epistles (1.19, 2.1, 2.2), were taken as a poetic illustration of the theoretical principles that guided the teachings these new pious men were to put in practice and therefore intellectually renovate the Russian Orthodox realm, or at least not lag behind other Catholic lands.

In the Academy, poetry learned, called *artificialis* as opposed to *naturalis*, could be divided in two forms: *poesis docens* and *poesis utens*. The first was the artful exposition of poetic rules by means of poetry, whereas the latter was the incorporation of the rules learned, duly acquired through the first, which seamlessly created works of art that affected ease and naturality.⁷⁹ Mastery was achieved through diligent effort (*exercitatio/labor*) by means of imitation of the models. AP was the archetypical example of *poesis docens* in this context, and some of its doctrines gained a prestige that would continue to affect the subsequent generation of Russian poets, made up by writers now no longer part of an ecclesiastical scholastic world,

⁷⁵ For an account of the sentence, cf. Ringler, 1941.

⁷⁶ Siedina, 2015, pp.50-55.

⁷⁷ FAIRCLOUGH, 2005, pg. 479.

⁷⁸ SIEDINA, 2011, pg. 43.

⁷⁹ Cf. Siedina, 2016, pg.23.

but still members of the great succession of poetic authorities who everyone who wrote was anxious to be affiliated to.

This emphasis in exercise produced several poetic experiments that might help to provide some illustration on the strategies and views shared by the first secular authors of Russian poetry, used in some of their compositions. Whether they were simple translation, or turning poetry into prose, prose into poetry, or more sophisticated experiments such as centos or parodies, these exercises constituted the core of perhaps the most important factor in the making of a new poet: the imitation of authoritative models. One particular type of exercise that adopted Horace as the model was the *Parodia Horatiana*, a procedure applied especially to the odes, where the most famous of them or more polemical according to a Christian worldview, were taken in their integral metrical and elocutionary structure, with only some keywords in the original replaced, reconceptualizing its usually pagan, or erotic, meaning into a “purified” Christian poem, vouched by the authority of the greatest lyric poet of the Roman world. A century later, very similar Horatian compositions would be effected in the works of, for instance, Vasily Kapnist with his Horatian Odes in the first years of the 19th C. The reception of Horace’s lyrical production is not within the scope of this thesis, but its study might be greatly benefited if it has a starting point in the early poetical experiments of the Kievan preceptors.

To sum up, the principle of *poesis artificialis*, and one of its hypostases, *poesis utens* was the main element that governed the teaching of poetics in the Academy of Kiev. The unavoidable scholastic, pedagogic, normative character of the institution, whose foremost goal was the creation of illustrated pious men, placed a special emphasis on Horace’s hexametric production, especially the AP. In this wise, the Kievans saw it roughly in the same way as the old medieval men of letters who first received, read, annotated, commented and imitated the text: not just as a poem on poetry with all the inconsistencies and peculiarities allowed for in a

poem, but as a versified manual that was expected to be figured out and explained in the correct arrangement of its parts. Besides, the appropriation of Horace as an instructor of morals was still as much present in the worldview of these men of letters as in, for instance, those from the 9th C., with several Latin compositions and exercises presenting devices such as the *parodia Horatiana*, shows that above all the Kievans were included in the millenary tradition of Scholastic Latinity. How much of this worldview the men of letters from the new, modern, culturally revolutionary Petrine Russia shared with this now old-fashioned worldview is something that I will try to answer in the following chapters.

Chapter 2: Polemics in the first generation.

In the first chapter, I intended to present the literary tradition in Russian lands that preceded the trends brought about by the new Petrine culture that promoted a rupture with the church-oriented traditional Russian culture. Their relations with Horace, still linked with the image of teacher of letters and mores, reach back to the great philological tradition to western medieval readings of his work. In such tradition, the idea of imitation of the great literary authorities was the principal factor for poetic invention and composition, with Horace being one of its central authorities, due to his most influential composition, the AP. If one was to write with the appropriateness and decorum required by a literary system ruled by imitation and emulation, Horace would naturally be the first master of poetry chosen by those who dared to venture in the craft.

In this second chapter, I want to present two central figures of the first generation of modern Russian literature in their literary practices, still governed by the imitation of the best models of eloquence, but now faced with a crisis of procedure that the ever-growing demands for originality would provoke in a literary field that had to be attuned with the European literary trends. This was only the first manifestation of the so-called paradox of classicism, that states that “the closer one comes to the classical Greek and Roman models the more privileged one’s own national version can be as it lay claims to being the definite appropriation of tradition.”⁸⁰ In addition, especially in the first generation these imitative practices generated a very particular striving for primacy, in being the first who introduced the model to a new context, thereby establishing the tradition in his own developing country.

⁸⁰ KAHN, 2018, pg. 206.

The wish for becoming as the poet who “was the first to bring the Aeolian verse to the tunes of Italy,”⁸¹ generated in their imitative practices an *anxiety for precedence*, while at the same time having to abide by the requirement to be “the first to plant free footsteps on a virgin soil”.⁸² In this chapter I intend to address this question by tackling a few issues taken from one of the first and most famous literary polemics in 18th C. Russia, the one between Vasily Trediakovsky and Aleksandr Sumarokov. In parallel, I shall provide a reading of some Horatian remarks on the question of imitation and originality, taken from his epistles on literary matters (chiefly from Epist. 1.3, 1.19) as a way to provide a reflection on what was really at stake in the establishment of the new literary field.

I would like also to make a brief remark on terminology. I understand here the term literary anxiety in a quite different way as proposed by Harold Bloom in his towering essay. The anxiety of influence, as proposed by the critic, is an impulse present in most (or all) strong poets, in order to shake off the weight the works of their predecessors represented in their own and thereby assert the individuality of their own work. This is carried out basically by a deliberately mistaken reading of the work of one’s predecessor, in a “swerve” from the imposing figure, “a deliberate, even perverse revisionism” of the author influencing the anxious poet, termed by the critic as a “poetic misprision”, and later developed in other “betrayals”.⁸³

In Russia, with its first indisputably strong poet, Pushkin, this model did not apply as, for instance, to Keats or Wordsworth, poets whose generation had the shadows of Milton or a Shakespeare above them. The generational interplay between Pushkin and his strongest predecessor, Derzhavin, was felt in a much lighter way, for Pushkin’s literary qualities in respect to the poets of the former generations were so outstanding that when his moment came,

⁸¹ Horace. Odes, 3.30. vv. 13-14 (RUDD, 2004).

⁸² Horace Epist., 1.19. vv. 21-22 (FAIRCLOUGH, 2005).

⁸³ Bloom, 1997.

there was not much anxiety for shaking off the literary influences of greater predecessors in order to assert himself. Rather, there was a light, facetious, relationship to his predecessors in a way that sometimes reached a scorching iconoclasm.⁸⁴ Pushkin was in a very peculiar literary situation, for his huge talents were displayed in a moment when the literary activities in Russia shifted from a patron-poet mode of subsidy to a market-based profession that entailed a broad public sphere of readers who had their tastes regarded but at the same time shaped by the production of a strong writer.

In addition, Pushkin was still part of a literary system that had imitation as a primary mover of rhetorical invention and could not be detached from this classicist perspective. As Andrew Kahn puts in his study on Pushkin's lyrical intelligence:

*In a literary culture that laid emphasis on invention as the fundamental value of poetic originality, poets with a future never wished to be seen escaping the past.*⁸⁵

Pushkin was writing in a century-old literary culture with many more or less talented literates competing, cooperating, and experimenting in the decades preceding his career. For the first generation of Russian poets, however, the situation was a very different and the demands for poetic affiliation were much more pressing. Here it was of utmost importance to be identified with the predecessors, for what it was strived after was to be recognised as the foundational element of a tradition that does not yet exist in the language or culture it is being transplanted into. Therefore, the anxiety felt by some poets in the first generation of Russian poetry is indeed very prominent but of a very different kind. Unlike the relationship with poetic

⁸⁴ Cf. for instance the letter to Zhukovsky, where Sumarokov and Trediakovsky are represented in conversing in hell.

⁸⁵ KAHN, 2008, pg. 21.

predecessors proposed by Bloom, where there is a *swerve* from the work of older poets, here the anxiety is actually to reclaim for themselves the name of influential predecessors from other more prestigious literary systems into their own, especially those that were considered the sources of the tradition, the *protoi heuretai*. Thus, I propose to call this type of relationship an *anxiety for precedence*.

The anxiety of influence is a striving for differentiation, whereas the anxiety for precedence is a striving for identification. Only the first may be a characteristic of a truly strong poet and would arguably only happen in Russia in the beginning of the 19th C., the moment of the so-called Golden Age of Russian poetry, the crowning of the century-old tradition inaugurated by the era of Peter the Great. The second, on the other hand, is a more modest ambition from the point of view of an originality-oriented literary mentality, but not in a literary context governed by imitation and the authority of models, especially if this literary paradigm is inserted into a realm that was unacquainted with it but had in the background a political program of consolidation of prestige and power. It thus consists in self-aggrandizing by borrowing the fame from a great voice of a prestigious literary past by grafting their poetic practices into a linguistic context that still lack this tradition but needs it for the affirmation of political and cultural purposes.

As I hope to demonstrate throughout the chapter, this kind of literary anxiety is a subproduct of ideologies of translation of influence that intend to borrow from more ancient and influential representations of power into new structures that need a such an affirmation for their geopolitical purposes. As mentioned in the introduction, *Translatio Imperii* was an ideological procedure adopted in Russia, first organically filtered through Eastern Orthodoxy, in the idea of Moscow as Third Rome, and then abruptly in the times of Peter the Great, with the direct approximation to the “First Rome”, of Augustus. In the same fashion, the foremost preoccupation of poets thus oriented is to be identified with the main poetic authorities of the

prestigious past, already being emulated in the political sphere. Thus, to be a Russian Anacreon or a Pindar was a very much coveted accomplishment to vie for against other possible poet-competitors in a context that lacked the tradition these authoritative names represent. This chapter intends to analyse these dynamics in one episode of the literary polemics that took place in 18th C. Russia, illustrating it with a few passages from Horace.

What did it mean to be identified as a Russian Horace? Unlike with other models, and the most flagrant example is the association made most eloquently by Sumarokov between Lomonosov and Pindar, the approximation with the Venutian as the recognition of one's poetic achievements was usually not explicit to the point of calling one given poet of this first generation the Russian Horace. Certainly, there were instances where Horatian qualities were bestowed by admirers upon more prestigious poets. For the sake of the example take historian, poet and political Ivan Perfilevich Yelagin (1725-94), in a verse epistle addressed to his "revered teacher" Sumarokov, where he asks the "Russian Racine" a small part of the Horatian strength in the final verses of the composition. However, the external identification with Horace was part of the internal anxiety each poet displayed in being associated with the prestigious model, and the most direct way of identification, especially in a moment when there was absolutely no access to his work in the new language, was through translation. Imitations, and subsequent emulations would also be the next steps in the means of appropriation and were more prevalent with poets of the subsequent generations, but by no means it was necessarily a posterior development.

Horace as the teacher of moral philosophy through the Epistles and Satires, was also the teacher of poetry regardless of how incohesive his AP was if taken as a technical manual.

In the first chapter we have seen part of the reverence paid to this great teacher, but here it was of equal measure as the reverence paid to the language and the cultural system he was part of. Now it was a matter of presenting this master in the new Russian language, to spread his teachings to a public completely unacquainted with Latinity that had to be brought up in a new imposed literary context that took much from the Latin heritage, but only insofar as a means to establish itself as a self-standing and strong power structure. Now, it was a matter of making Horace speak in a language that was to vie with its most prestigious predecessors because it afterall was a language that could proudly boast to have all the main qualities of its contemporary European languages, plus “the richness and the strong conciseness in representation of Greek and Latin languages”.⁸⁶

The first translation endeavour to a Horatian text belonged to Antiokh Dmitrevich Kantemir. As we shall see in the fourth chapter, his translation of the two books of Epistles crowned a literary career that had started by the luminous example of the first satires and, for that matter, the first non-religious poetic compositions ever composed in Russian language, in emulation of Horace. Due to his formal attachments with the past and the fact that he was far from the budding poetic circles of the new Russian language, he was cast aside and even ignored as a relevant literary pioneer. The task to bring Horace to the Russian language would be taken up a few years later. The first complete Horatian work to be translated into Russian was carried out by Vasily Kirilovitch Trediakovsky and Nikolai Nikitich Popovsky in 1753 with the publication of their translations of the AP, as part of a broader literary polemic that had in Trediakovsky one of its main participants. In this chapter I wish to present a question that reached a tipping point in 1747, involving one of the main issues in the formation of a literature: the question of poetic imitation.

⁸⁶ As Lomonosov famously stated in the preface to his Grammar of the Russian Language. Lomonosov, PSS, vol. 7, pg. 391.

Vasily Kirilovitch Trediakovsky, the literary pioneer who entered history as “the fool of the new Russian literature”,⁸⁷ was responsible for significant literary endeavours, especially with the translations he made of great authorities from the past, and modern, contemporary would be authorities from other more established vernacular traditions. Among these translations is the first integral translation of Horace’s AP. Composed between 1750 and 1752, it would be published in 1753, a moment when his popularity was already reaching its lowest points, in the collection that comprised his two-decade output as writer and critic, named *Sochinyeny i Perevody tak stikhami kak i prozoiu* (Compositions and Translations in Verse and Prose, herein after SiP).⁸⁸ With this work, Trediakovsky intended to safeguard certain relevance to his name after being brushed aside by the young Lomonosov in the beginning of the 1740s and utterly ridiculed and excluded from the budding canon of Russian poetry by an even younger man who intended to force his way into its most prestigious positions, Aleksander Sumarokov. Works like Sumarokov’s Second Epistle (on Versification) (*Epistola II, o Stikhotvorstve*), written in 1747, and the comedy Tresotinius (1750), vilified the older poet and served as the first instance in Russian literature where a writer would be demoted to mere laughing stock in literary matters.

Furthermore, in 1751, Lomonosov had published an edition of his collected works, the first anthology ever published in the new Russian literature by one of its poets, what possibly made Trediakovsky feel compelled to bring forth a collection of his own. Such move, in fact, may have secured some relevance to the poet’s memory, since, apart from his *Tilemakhida* and his translations of French historian Charles Rollin, most of the works collected in these two

⁸⁷ For the mythologies created in the 18th C. around his and Lomonosov’s names cf. Reyfman, 1991.

⁸⁸ Trediakovski, 2009.

volumes remained scattered or unpublished and he, as the pioneer he first vied to be, hardly would have survived the derision and scorn he was subjected to until the reassessments of his figure by Radishchev and, to some extent, Pushkin.⁸⁹

SiP is a double-tome collection of translations, theoretical articles, poems, speeches, and general reflections. It is introduced by a preface to the reader and ends with an address to his two books, following the same convention as effected, for instance, by Horace in *Epist.* I. The first tome contains works more oriented to the theory of poetry, whereas the second houses several original and translated poetic undertakings. It is here where we find his translation of the AP, placed immediately after his translation of Boileau's *Art Poétique* and before the reassessment of his 1735 New Brief Method on the Disposition of Verses, the first theoretical treatise to propose the syllabo-tonic system for Russian versification. Unlike the AP, the translation of the *Art Poétique* is presented in verses, in the peculiar manner of alternating the versification choice for each of its four cantos: the first is rendered in iambic hexameters and the second in trochaic hexameters, presenting feminine caesurae in the seventh syllable with masculine endings and vice-versa. Cantos three and four follow the same pattern.

After his translation of the AP, we find the revised edition of his work on Russian versification. It was the main access route 19th C. poets and people of letters had to Trediakovsky's ideas and proposals to the formal aspects of Russian poetry, contributing to dispel certain features of the abiding myth that turned poor old Trediakovsky into a chthonic monster that could only speak nonsense.⁹⁰ In this manual, he reconsidered some of the positions presented seventeen years earlier, accepting some of the innovations introduced by Lomonosov

⁸⁹ Cf. Pushkin, especially in his first years, never missed an opportunity for deriding Trediakovsky, the most flagrant example being the epistle to Zhukovsky (1816), but towards the end of his life recognised the merits of the old pioneer in his formal experimenting. Cf. Reyfman, 1991, pp. xx-xx.

⁹⁰ Radischev and, above all, Pushkin were the first ones, according to Reyfman, 1993, pp. XX ff. to dispel the caricature produced all throughout the 18th C., aptly named by her a literary myth, by substituting the anecdotal evidence by a source-based more scientific approach to Trediakovsky's contributions.

such as allowing for iambic feet and masculine rhymes, features that should have been banned from Russian poetry if his 1735 manual was to be its definitive formal prescription. The remainder of the first tome comprises one article on the assumed beginning of poetry (*Account on the Beginning of Poetry and Versification in General*), a letter on the usefulness of poetry to the to the State (*Letter to a Friend on the Current Utility of Poetry to the State*), and a few Aesopian fables composed in the same manner as the translation of the *Art Poétique*, alternating iambic and trochaic hexameters.

The second tome starts with a speech read in 1735 to the Academy of Sciences (On the Purity of Our Language), followed by several solemn panegyric odes, among which is his famous Judgement on the Ode in General (composed in imitation of Boileau's *Discours sur l'Ode*), renderings of psalms and prophets' songs, another speech said to have received a "great prize on eloquence"⁹¹ (*On Patience and Impatience*), some strophes on several topics, the *Judgement on Comedy in General*, some verses in different metres taken from his translation of Barclay's *Arenide*, a few translations from French and Latin and, finally, a funeral ode on Peter, the Great. The collection is closed by an address in alexandrine couplets to his two tomes.

The introductory preface reads rather like a defence of his translation choices against some presumably heavy criticism. For Trediakovsky spends over two thirds of this introduction explaining his choices for translating the aforementioned arts, with rebuffs to probable (or very real for his circumstances) objections against them. In these replies, he addresses a series of issues regarding general topics on translation, to the point of producing a brief guide with criteria that makes a good one. The two objections mentioned in the introduction (whether a good verse to verse or prose to prose translation were possible without losing the force and vitality of the original, and how could his translation of Boileau be any good if he used both

⁹¹ Trediakovsky, 2009, pg. 15.

iambic and trochaic verses) are duly answered, and at least the second of them is clearly addressed to Lomonosov. They regard his well-known objections to Trediakovsky's trochaic meter found especially in the 1739 Letter on Russian Versification and in the triple translation of the Psalms from 1744, a joint venture of which participated as well the young Sumarokov, measuring the talents of the three principal poets of the generation. The first objection, however, was most likely addressed to Sumarokov, as demonstrated in Alekseeva (2006).

The reply to the second objection retakes the main arguments around the use of trochaic and iambic meters. Basically, it is a rebuff to the position that each verse form had intrinsic semantic features naturally imbued, affirming the total semantic arbitrariness of each metric foot: Trochaic verses are not in themselves tender, and iambics are not intrinsically solemn. The translation of the *Art Poétique*, with alternating feet choices for each canto, was the culmination of such reasoning, but, at first, Trediakovsky used several arguments to demonstrate and try to discredit Lomonosov's claim that iambic verses are in themselves solemn due to the fact that they "quietly rise intensifying the nobility of the subject".⁹² He composed two verses expressing the same idea in two different forms (one using a trochaic, the other an iambic basis), compared contradictory accounts by ancient authorities (Aristotle via Quintilian: *iambus humanior videtur* and Horace: *popularis vincentem strepitus*⁹³) and asserted that if fallings or ascensions determined the solemnity or tenderness of a given foot, then Homer and Virgil would not have composed in a system that has a falling cadence, the dactyl-spondaic, but rather in the opposite, the anapaest-pyrrhic, as he puts. This is part of the better-known and better-registered polemic that helped shape Russian poetic forms in the 18th C.,⁹⁴ but the first objection is of greater concern to this thesis.

⁹² Lomonosov. PSS, Tome 7, pg. 15.

⁹³ I.O. X.X.X quoting Arist. Poet. [BECKER]: "iambus seems more human." AP, vv. 80-81: "surpassing the clamor of the people." Cf. Trediakovsky took this argument from Sanadon ***

⁹⁴ The earlier one started by Lomonosov with his 1739 Letter on Versification, concerning the best formal prosodical systems to the budding Russian language. Cf. Frate, 2016.

In this reply, Trediakovsky appealed above all to the most common and compelling argument of a literary system that is governed by tradition and prestige: the argument of authority. He first addresses the question of verse-to-verse translation, mentioning the experience of Roman authors in turning Greek works into Latin (Cicero's verse translation of Aratus in *De Natura Deorum* and Terence's renderings of Menander with Cicero's opinion on its outstanding quality). Then comes the output of modern translations by and of French authors, with the mentions of an unnamed translation of Pope "on matters of morality"⁹⁵ and the surprising citation of a Portuguese verse translation of Boileau's *Art Poétique* by Count of Ericeira, which Trediakovski presents as someone who had been particularly lauded by the Frenchman in their correspondence.⁹⁶ He moves on to Jean Segrais' translation of the Aeneid and to the experiences Corneille and Racine had with the Classics.

The reply developed in the puzzling assertion of prose renderings of prose originals, among which he includes a few prose translations of works written in verse. In a list that seems to miss the point (simply due to the fact that his translation of the AP did not fall into the category of prose-to-prose translation), Trediakovsky produces a similar list of contemporary French translations of authors such as Tacitus, Cicero, Lucian, Xenophon, Arrian, Caesar and Thucydides. The only mentions of translators who turned poems into prose are those of Homer by Madame Dacier and the translations of Horace by her husband, André, along with those by Noël-Étienne Sanadon. As mentioned, these two last translations were the commented editions consulted by Trediakovsky in the production of his own along with the notes he appended to it. The argument is concluded with the remarks that there are cases in which translations are so

⁹⁵ Trediakovsky refers to the *Essay on Man*.

⁹⁶ Francisco Xavier de Meneses (1673-1743), 4th count of Ericeira, Portuguese man of letters who maintained correspondence with Boileau and other contemporary writers, playing a minor role in Portuguese letters. The Academy of Sciences of Saint Petersburg counted him among its correspondents, having awarded him several books from its library. Trediakovsky may have missed the irony of Boileau's complement to the count. Cf. Candido, XX

good that it becomes impossible to tell which is better, the original or the translation. Such would be the case of Vaugelas' version of Quintus Curtius Rufus' fragmentary History of Alexander.

Following this catalogue of authorities, Trediakovsky presents a brief "*ars tradutoria*", summarising the essential qualities shared by the translations of all the names in the list. Nine are the conditions that would produce a good translation, spelled out in a way that reminds the precepts on imitation found in the Jesuit-oriented manuals of the Academy of Kiev, especially the one by Prokopovich. The representation of the whole idea in the original, the warning that the translation should not lose its strength, the flow (likely the syntactic cadence) that must remain as presented in the original text, the importance of clarity and vigour of expression, that the words be appropriate to the thoughts expressed, the prevention against solecisms and barbarisms, the tightness (*zatychek*) of the output text, being always seamless, refraining to take many freedoms, the unnecessariness of transferring all the words from the original, as long as they keep the same size/length of the original and all ideas therein contained. All these precepts govern a good translation, according to Trediakovsky.

Finally, to conclude the reasoning present all throughout Trediakovsky's theoretical works, he produces his own examples with the characteristics just enumerated. He presents two of them in distinct approaches: A distich taken from Voltaire's *Merope*, and the first line from Horace's *Odes* 3.3. The former is rendered in exactly the same form, without additions or subtractions, conveying exactly the same message as in the original. The second translates one 11-syllable Latin line in two iambic hexameter couplets, keeping up with the same ideas presented in the original, but clumsily adding extra words in a different phrasing. In order to supposedly do this correctly, he presents an informative paraphrase of Horace's line signalling to an intermediate step a translator is advised to take in order to render an original poem

correctly: he should first translate the plain meaning of the text and then take up the reworking of the form.

The conclusion of this first reply, however, could corroborate the fact that he was subjected to unjust complaints by picky detractors: if my translations present all these characteristics, then these reprimands are unjustified, for they concern only me, and not those names were worthy of their fames as great translators. Despite some awkwardness in these justifications, this preface is a typical defence against detractors and might serve as a guide to the translation and compositional methods Trediakovsky employed in his oeuvre. It appealed to the authorities he was better acquainted with, the Ancient Romans and the French, and derived many of his theoretical presuppositions from the latest works on philology and literary theory of his time, including those produced in Russian lands a few decades before his SiP.

Following the reconstruction presented in Alekseeva (2006), Trediakovsky was here fending off attacks by the younger poet Aleksander Petrovich Sumarokov. As well known, Sumarokov was the main actor of the second polemic in which Trediakovsky was involved, following his first quarrel with Lomonosov in the late 1730's, regarding the formal characteristics of Russian poetry. But unlike the first altercation, where in 1739 Lomonosov addressed Trediakovsky's 1735 positions, by simply ignoring his contender's name, and going on with his business of writing his own theoretical assessments and attaching to them the foundational monument of Russian poetry⁹⁷, this time the old pioneer was viciously attacked.

⁹⁷ The 1739 Ode on the Taking of Khotin.

Sumarokov is best remembered for his pioneering work in the theatre, but the poet is also very much remembered for producing a prescriptive art of poetry to the Russian literary scene with his 1747 First and Second Epistle (On Russian Language and On Versification). Following Boileau's model, the most famous poetic art in 18th C. Russia, it endeavoured to include its author's name in the succession line of poems dealing exclusively in matters of poetry, thereby establishing a canon to which he would include himself, with the prerogatives of the post of poetic legislator. It is one great example of poetic emulation, employing several procedures which will be discussed further on, but a detailed analysis of this poem in relation to its models is beyond the scope of the present study and should be left to another occasion. A different aspect therein contained is of greater concern here.

As with earlier attempts of inclusion in a prestigious canon,⁹⁸ a major concern for this epistle is the inclusion of Russian poetry among the great literary tradition of western Europe started in Ancient Greece. This was also one of the first times when a derisory direct attack on Trediakovsky as a writer was clearly carried out. Here was the first time that the name *Shtivelius* was used, thereby creating a caricature of a poetaster that could only be used as negative example. This caricature was inspired by a character from a play written by Danish writer Ludvig Holbert, which portrays a pedantic and ultimately stupid professor of mathematics from the 16th C., that came to Russia via German translation, and became a stock character for a pedantic and ultimately stupid individual.⁹⁹ Immediately after this slander, Sumarokov pays tribute to Lomonosov with the extraordinary comparison of the polymath with Malherbe and Pindar, making him the first true pioneer, the true founding father to be included among the great names of their literary past. He could not be clearer that the battered pioneer

⁹⁸ Such as the already mentioned, *Epistle to Apollo from the Russian letters*, by Trediakovsky contained in his 1735 *Method on Composition*. Cf. Kahn et al. 2018 pp. 206ff.

⁹⁹ The play in question was written by Jacob von Thyboe, with reminiscences of the *Commedia dell'arte*. Cf. Reyfman, 1993.

was definitely out of this incipient hall of fame; on the contrary, Trediakovsky was turned into an archetype, a patron saint of bad and pedantic writers and a negative model that the new writers should avoid at all costs.¹⁰⁰

The offense is even greater when taking into consideration the other epistle by Sumarokov on literary matters, written in the same year as a foreword to this, the Epistle 1, on Russian Language (*Epistola I – o Russkom Iazyke*). The topic of increasing the poetic corpus of a language through translation is very prominent in the letter. In several instances Sumarokov despised and even asserted the futility of such endeavour as a poetical translation. As someone who had never engaged up to that time in such craft,¹⁰¹ he prescribes that the only true type of appropriation of a work written in a different language should be effected through imitation or emulation.

This less commented poem is another hallmark in the linguistic reflexions that formed the modern Russian literature. Focusing on composition, style, and the proper use of Russian language, it basically claims that, despite having a full potential, this new language still lacked capable writers. Those who were writing at the time could only produce unsatisfactory texts due to the lack of respect for the features proper to their mother tongue:

Довольно наш язык в себе имеет слов,
Но нет довольного числа на нем писцов.
Один, последуя несвойственному складу,
Влечет в Германию Российскую Палладу
И, мня, что тем он ей приятства придает,

¹⁰⁰ Sumarokov (1793) vv. XX

¹⁰¹ Ibid., pg. 21.

Природну красоту с лица ея берет.
Другой, не выучась так грамоте, как должно,
По-русски, думает, всего сказать не можно,
И, взяв пригоршни слов чужих, сплетает речь
Языком собственным, достойну только сжечь.
Иль слово в слово он в слог русский переводит,
Которо на себя в обнове не походит.
Тот прозой скаредной стремится к небесам
И хитрости своей не понимает сам.
Тот прозой и стихом ползет, и письма оны,
Ругаячи себя, дает писцам в законы.

(vv. 19-34)

(our language contains enough words / but there aren't enough writers for it. / One of them
through an inadequate form / takes to Germany the Russian Palladium / and thinking it will
give him full satisfaction / removes all the beauty from its complexion. / Another without
learning the letters as he should, / thinks that he cannot say in Russian everything, / and taking
from other languages a handful of foreign words he weaves / in a language of his own a
discourse suited only for the fire. / Or he translates to Russian forms word-by-word, / which in
the reproduction never matches. / That one in meagre prose intends to soar to heaven / and all
that cunning he fails to understand. / The other crawls in prose and verse and in some letters, /
addressed to himself, he condemns the writers.)

(nossa língua em si contém palavras o bastante / mas bastante não há nela um número de
escritores. / um deles seguindo uma forma não inadequada, / traz à Alemanha o paládio russo,

/ e, crendo que ela lhe dará a satisfação / retira de sua face a beleza natural. / Um outro sem aprender como se deve as letras, / em russo pensa tudo não poder dizer / e, ao tomar punhado de palavras estrangeiras, tece o discurso / em uma língua própria apenas para o fogo. / ou palavra por palavra ao estilo russo ele traduz, / que na reprodução a si não se parece. / Aquele em prosa mesquinha se precipita aos céus, / e toda essa agudeza nem ele mesmo entende. / Aquele em prosa e em verso rasteja e em certas cartas / que entrega a si próprio, condena os escritores).

This polemical portion in the poem addresses unnamed Russian writers and translators who had committed faults in their respective production. At first, vv. 21-24 are directed to writers who would compose their Russian texts employing German syntax or features peculiar to that language, but not to Russian.¹⁰² It continues the argument with an attack against some writer who, lacking the proper grammatical knowledge indispensable in writing, concludes that the only way one can express himself in Russian is to borrow from foreign languages. Then comes an attack directed against methods of translation: rendering a text from the source-language word by word is to take constructions and phrases alien to the target-language. The concluding verses are a reproach against too lofty prose and its use with the principles of versified language.

Vv. 29-30, remind of a well-known section in the AP, concerned with the creation of new subject matter. In vv. 120-152, Horace addresses the construction of plot by ways of the construction of characters, applying his demands for unity to the particular roles to be performed in a play. Whether taking from what tradition has left (the myth) or creating them

¹⁰² Lomonosov comes to mind as the target of these attacks, but according to Berkov (XXXX) in the notes for [HIS EDITION], the attack is hinted at German members of the Academy. An attack on Lomonosov would in fact sound strange in face of the compliment in the Second Epistle.

from scratch (*proferre ignota indictaque primus*, to be the first to proffer unknown and unsaid things v.130), it is necessary to observe a few precepts. In any case, it is preferred to take from the already established mythological inventory, and one of these precepts applies to when one takes from sources written in a foreign language (in that case, Greek). It is advised that the poet do not follow closely the wording of the texts bestowed by tradition when appropriating to their language. But in this case Horace is rather concerned with the mimetic appropriation that will create a work, while partaking in a traditional succession of authoritative names and will confer to the new work the authority of the canon.¹⁰³ However, to be inserted in this traditional canon, at the same time one must be original, that is, not to be a *fidus interpres*, a servile translator who only renders the model word by word.

Sumarokov likely had these Horatian verses in mind when he composed his own, but above all he was speaking to and of his contemporaries. Following Alekseeva (2006), he was aiming at Trediakovsky in the attacks starting on vv. 25, taking him as the primary example of a servile imitator.¹⁰⁴ Some principles employed in some of his works, such as his own Ode on the Taking of Gdansk, following very closely Boileau's *Ode sur la Prise de Namur*, would go against the principles defended here. In addition, some of the points Trediakovsky defended theoretically and carried out in practice in SiP four years later may seem at first opposed to those presented in the letter. Despite not prescribing a word-by-word translation, he keeps up with the idea of fidelity to the original. This is exactly what he seeks for his versions of Boileau and Horace. Unlike the paraphrasis or emulation of Boileau proposed by Sumarokov's theoretical practice in his Second Epistle, Trediakovsky creates a version that tries to keep as semantically close as possible to the source, maintaining the same number of verses and the highest possible fidelity to the ideas expressed. In regard to the AP, he adopted the most

¹⁰³ References Comm Brink, Rudd, Sanadon.

¹⁰⁴ TO ADD: notes from ed. Sovetsky Pisatel, polemics centred around Lomonosov and the "German translators", comments by Alekseeva in Tred, 2009 and Alekseeva 2006.

semantically faithful way of rendering a poetical text, informative prose, to the point of frequently adding or turning more complex Latin concepts expressed in one word into paraphrases that account for a more complete expressed meaning.

In another excerpt, Sumarokov continues his battering of bad translators (or particularly, Trediakovsky), now advancing positive qualities that must be followed by a good translator/imitator:

Посем скажу, какой похвален перевод:
Имеет в слоге всяк различие народ.
Что очень хорошо на языке французском,
То может в точности быть скаредно на русском.
Не мни, переводя, что склад в творце готов;
Творец дарует мысль, но не дарует слов.
В спряжение речей его ты не вдавайся
И свойственно себе словами украшайся.
На что степень в степень последовать ему?
Ступай лишь тем путем и область дай уму.
Ты сим, как твой творец письмом своим ни славен,
Достигнешь до него и будешь сам с ним равен.
Хотя перед тобой в три пуда лексикон,
Не мни, чтоб помощь дал тебе велику он,
Коль речи и слова поставишь без порядка,
И будет перевод твой некая загадка,
Которую никто не отгадает ввек;

То даром, что слова все точно ты нарек.
Когда переводить захочешь беспорочно,
Не то, —творцов мне дух яви и силу точно.
Язык наш сладок, чист, и пышен, и богат,
Но скупо вносим мы в него хороший склад.
Так чтоб незнанием его нам не бесславить,
Нам должно весь свой склад хоть несколько поправить.
Не нужно, чтобы всем над рифмами потеть,
А правильно писать потребно всем уметь.

[ENGLISH]

Por isso então direi, qual tradução será louvável: / Cada povo possui uma própria dicção
/ O que está muito bem na língua francesa, / pode muito bem ser avaro em língua russa. / não
pense, ao traduzir, que a dicção na obra está pronta, / o autor fornece ideia, mas não fornece as
palavras, / não vá se entregar às flexões de sua fala / e à sua própria maneira orne as suas
palavras. / Por que passo a passo seguir o seu autor? / Siga apenas o caminho e dê à mente
espaço. / / / ainda que em sua frente haja um léxico de três puds, / não creia que será de grande
ajuda / enquanto frases e palavras encontram-se em desordem / sua tradução será tal como uma
charada / a qual ninguém não resolverá jamais, / e à toa então pronunciaste as palavras exatas.
/ Quando fores traduzir, tu quererás impecavelmente / não isso – mas a essência e a força do
autor. / A nossa língua é doce, pura, rica e elevada / mas miseravelmente não lhe damos um
bom tom. / Para nós por ignorância não sermos desonrados, / teremos que ajeitar nosso tom

ainda que um pouco. / Não é preciso suar atrás de uma rima / mas escrever corretamente é imprescindível saber. (vv. 75-100)

“Not to translate word-by-word, but the essence and the strength,” does not really contradict what Trediakovsky prescribed for a good translation in his preface.¹⁰⁵ The correct usage of language “without barbarisms and solecisms” are also present in the list of translation virtues of his preface, where it states the necessity of writing correctly, in accordance to the grammar. Besides, even though Trediakovsky warns against the dangers of taking too many freedoms in a translation, calling for a plain, seamless product in the end, he does not forbid them, but only warns that they should be used in moderation. The only point in which Sumarokov actually would be at odds with Trediakovsky here is in the insistence that the tone and style of the translation must be in complete accordance only with what is natural and peculiar to the target language. This is the foremost criterion to be observed in a translation. However, the statement that a word-by-word translation is not essential as long as the message and the length of the original are respected is another patent point of similarity between the two composers.¹⁰⁶ If Sumarokov’s epistle in this part is really directed against Trediakovsky, then it was either a mean caricature of his positions on translation, or the latter changed his mind when writing the preface to his SiP.

Looking at some of his earlier appropriations of other authors, the fact that Trediakovsky took, for instance, from Boileau’s *Ode sur la Prise de Namur*, roughly the same

¹⁰⁵ Trediakovsky (2009), pg. 11: Впрочем, к сему **не всеконечно** требуется, чтоб в переводе быть тем же самым словам и стольким же — сие многократно и почти всегда есть выше человеческих сил — но чтоб были токмо равномерные и, конечно, с теми точно самими идеями. (Em suma, não é imprescindível que em uma tradução haja as mesmas e o mesmo número de palavras — isto estaria por demais quase sempre acima das forças humanas — mas que sejam de igual medida e, naturalmente, tenham as mesmas ideias.) Cf. Appendix B, pp. XX-XX.

¹⁰⁶ This is the gist of v. 94 творцов мне дух яви и силу точно.

form, the same images and a slightly longer length for his Ode on the Taking of Gdansk (1734), the first Russian attempt in the genre that would indisputably establish Lomonosov's fame, may have been one of the factors that opened a breach that led Sumarokov's epistle to consider that Trediakovsky inappropriately incurred in a word-by-word, servile, translation. In this case, he should have taken more liberties, if he were to imitate with the intention of emulating the model. If this was beyond Trediakovsky's scope, after all he intended to transplant the French ode with roughly the same theoretical reflections by Boileau into Russian soil, thereby establishing as a sort of Russian Boileau¹⁰⁷, it did not matter. It was considered a servile imitation which did not depart sufficiently from the model as expected in emulation. This was the extent of originality required in this authority-based literary system, and Sumarokov would be first in showing how it was supposed to be done. Thirteen years later he turned Boileau into an authentic Russian composition, shedding, like his model,¹⁰⁸ all the scorn and gall against his literary enemies in the polemical manner expected from his times – even though what he proposed was not that different in the end.

The quarrel proceeded, and Trediakovsky would go on to accuse Sumarokov of incurring in plagiarism not only of Boileau, but of many French tragedians in his dramatic works. The notorious 1750 *Letter from a Friend to a Friend*¹⁰⁹ is a, possibly helpless, reply to the attacks by that impudent playwright who had just soiled his name as a writer with the comedy *Tresotinius*. It is composed as a letter send by an anonymous friend to another as if

¹⁰⁷ Let us remind that both Boileau's ode and the *Discours* were the most famous replies to the attacks against the ancients carried through Charles Rollin in his polemical writings, especially the *Paralleles*.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. the polemical portions of the *Art Poétique*.

¹⁰⁹ Письмо, в котором содержится рассуждение о стихотворении, поныне на свет изданном от автора двух од, двух трагедий и двух эпистол, писанное от приятеля к приятелю. (Carta que contém juízo sobre a poesia recém editada por um autor de duas odes, duas tragédias e duas epístolas escritas de um amigo para um amigo.)

Trediakovsky and Sumarokov were acquaintances of both, the latter being reproached in his literary abilities for the vile attacks on the former. The comedy in question was the spark that led to the letter. In it the defender affirms to his friend:

“Эпистола о стихотворстве русском вся Боало Денрова. В Эпистоле об языке русском почитай все ж чужие мысли.”

(A Epístola sobre versificação é toda Boileau-Despreaux. Na Epístola sobre a língua russa, [tu só encontrarás [ao que tudo indica todos] são pensamentos alheios).

(The Epistle on versification is all Boileau-Despreaux. In the epistle on Russian language you will only find foreign ideas).

This claim is made after an accusation of aping his models in tragedies composed by the man who would later be regarded as the “Father of Russian Theatre”, including his adaptation of Hamlet, which, as a matter of fact, in nothing resembles the original or the French prose translation which Sumarokov used to compose his own.¹¹⁰ Pretty much all of Sumarokov’s most important compositions were here considered either works full of incoherence, grammar and spelling mistakes, solecisms, or servile and poor translations of French originals. In the list even the derogatory names Shtivelius and Tresotinius would be among those things copied without creativity, duly indicating the sources from which they were taken. The specific accusation here is that “the author lacked so much of [means of] invention, that he would not even create his own funny names.” His ineptitude for invention (and for that

¹¹⁰ Sumarokov did not read English and most likely read Hamlet on a French translation. His Hamlet is a radical departure from the Shakespearian text, which except for some of the characters in nothing resembles the original. Cf. Sumarokov (1787) T.3, pp 61-123. For an account of the appropriation cf. Levitt (2009), pp. 76-102.

matter, for all other parts of rhetoric as Trediakovsky would mention further on) is what here configures Sumarokov's lack of originality, and not his capacity to create new subjects or themes.

Presenting a thorough analysis of one of Sumarokov's solemn odes, one psalm paraphrase and one tragedy, Trediakovsky tried to show all the mistakes and inadequacies his rival would have committed in face of the demands contained in his own epistles. It is shown that he would contradict many of the precepts expounded in them: lack of grammatical knowledge, obscurity, logical contradiction, idle wording in the text, bluntness of thought, elocutionary discrepancies with base vocabulary being used in lofty genres – all of them prescriptions, required by Sumarokov in his own epistles, that he himself would infringe. On top of it all, Trediakovsky points to blunders in maybe the most important translation criterion (and criticism) presented in the epistles: the awkward appropriation of expressions that sound natural in the source but not in the target language.

Towards the end of the letter, Trediakovsky makes a puzzling statement, when asserting Sumarokov's servility:

“Язвительная его комедия не его, да Голбергова, но токмо у Автора она на свой образец; Гамлет Шекспиров, Эпистола о стихотворстве и по плану и по изображениям, но токмо сокращена, вся Боало-Депрова, а сего автора вся ж Горациева, но токмо распространена.”

(His scathing comedy is not his, but Holbert's, but only in the Author it is in its own form; Hamlet is Shakespeare's, the Epistle on versification is all Boileau-Despreaux, only shortened, and that from this author is all Horace, only lengthened.)

(sua maledicente comédia não é dele, mas de Holbert, mas apenas no Autor (i.e. Sumarókov) ela está nessa forma; o Hamlet é de Shakespeare; a Epístola sobre Versificação,

apenas abreviada, é toda de Boileau-Despreaux, e desse autor toda ela é de Horácio, apenas expandida).

Was here Boileau being considered a servile imitator in the same level? This is a strange remark on a revered authority from an already very established national tradition, but if the comparison of both poets' procedures is really deemed as unfavourable, it seems that at least Boileau endeavours to expand his own imitation, adding relevant material for his own times and necessities, whereas Sumarokov would be servile in the imitation and would only produce a shorter version of a copy that would have nothing to add? Or is it simply the fact that Sumarokov took from Boileau would show that he was able to imitate only at a three-degrees distance from the original work? In such a comment Trediakovsky may just have shown that he was unable to convincingly establish an engaging dialogue with tradition by not duly acknowledging Horace's efforts, and not serving as a decent synthesis of tradition, especially if one takes Trediakovsky's accusation that his rival did not know any Latin. Be that as it may, Sumarkov responds to this letter point by point in a much terser document, called *Reply to the Critic*. The passage in question received the following reply:

Епистола моя о стихотворстве, говорит он, вся Боалова, а Боало взял из Горация, Нет: Боало взял не все из Горация, а я не все взял из Боало. Кто захочет мою епистолу сличить с Боаловыми о стихотворстве правилами, тот ясно увидит, что я из Боало может быть не больше взял, сколько Боало взял из Горация, а что нечто из Боало взято, я в том и запираюсь никогда не хотел.

(My Epistle on Versification, he says, is all Boileau, whereas Boileau took his from Horace. Wrong: Not all did Boileau take from Horace, and I have not taken all from Boileau.

Whoever desires to compare my epistle with Boileau's rules on versification, shall clearly see that I from Boileau have not taken more than Boileau from Horace, and if something has been taken from Boileau, that I have never meant to hide).

(Minha epístola sobre versificação, diz ele, é toda Boileau, enquanto Boileau pegou a sua de Horácio. Errado: nem tudo Boileau pegou Horácio e eu nem tudo peguei de Boileau. Quem quiser comparar minha epístola com a de Boileau sobre as regras de composição poética verá claramente que eu não talvez não tenha pego mais de Boileau mais que ele pegou de Horácio o que eu peguei dele, isso eu nunca tentei esconder.)

It was certainly never considered a vice to take ideas or images or phrases from other authors. On the contrary, it was a necessity, provided that the end product was artful enough. The anxiety that moved the chain of poetic composition had at this moment in Russia a verbose and at times amusingly sad dispute in the engine of imitation that moves a literary medium, while holding it back. These ideas and themes had to be taken up in a way that presented flawless craftsmanship and sounded relevant to the given literary context, according to its expectations. Provided that a given composition presented such characteristics, the following requisite would be the freest possible departure from the model, having been invigorated by its authority, which would now share the same heights with its equal. Nobody could satisfactorily achieve that at that moment, and each of these uneasy pioneers, eager to achieve the laurels that would only be bestowed, one might say, 87 years later,¹¹¹ had to content with the task of

¹¹¹ With the composition of Pushkin's Emulation of Odes 3.30 (1837).

pointing out each other's petty (and sometimes identical) barbarisms in documents that afterwards would overall be read condescendingly.

Let us remind here Horace, in Ep. 1.19. He angrily calls himself an original poet maybe in face of petty attacks from other poets now forgotten, by claiming priority in introducing foreign models in his literary context, through taking solely their formal aspect and adopting a different matter and phrasing. This inspired voice of authority sounds so loud that the probable voices of his contenders became just echoes destined to faint to oblivion. The idea is evoked in the old topos of the runners-up and latecomers, one of the most visual examples of which is Propertius 3.1, represented as the topos of the triumph, with the laureated elegist on the car leading the parade with the less skilled writers following behind.¹¹² Horace is cruder in his depiction of wannabes: the true inspiration of wine becomes the ever-recurrent drunkenness that is nothing more than outward appearance.

The subsequent image paints the opposite in mood, showing someone who is Cato only in the looks but not in action, covering another extremity of the representation with a morality devoid of substance. The full realization of an authority is to be able, through flawless style, to imitate the great authorities of the past, reconceptualizing tradition and affirming a present has overcome the past glory. In the transference of prestige from the *fortes* of old,¹¹³ the new poet sets himself as the voice that best represents the particularities and inclinations of his times. In moments of rage, the angry Horace of Ep. 1.19 is the same one who introduced the metre and spirit of Archilocus, the angriest poet of Greece, but not his ethos. Sumarokov and Trediakovsky, tried their best in bringing forth the metres taken from the many layers of tradition. But the good part of their characters – and their poetry – would remain as the expressions of impotent outraged rage.

¹¹² Propertius 3.1.9-12.

¹¹³ Poets as much as kings. *Odes*, 4.9 v.20.

In Ep. 1.3 it is suggested that Florus' young friend, the assumedly not as gifted Celsus, that he "seek his own means and avoid touching what has been stored in mount Palatinus". The hinted amount of texts and books contained in the Temple of Apollo, with its ever-crescent now lost library maybe had showed a saturation point that allowed for few future authors to vie for their own inclusion in the selective memory of the Middle Ages Christian copyists some centuries later. Julius Florus, the addressee, *amicus* of Tiberius, is a gifted lawyer who cultivated the muses along with his friends in the "studious cohort", a learned coterie within the troops commanded by the Augustus' heir.¹¹⁴ Probably a writer in the already saturated epic genre, Florus is lauded by his ever-encouraging friend in being one of those who abundantly drink from the Pindaric spring. Horace praises the poet who does so, regardless of what he expresses in odes 4.2: when it comes to Pindar, instead of soaring like a Swan, it is better to compete in proportion, flying low like a bee.¹¹⁵ At any rate, it was important to avoid the cawing chatter of the servile herd that only bloats an already dying literary field.

To Florus is also addressed another poem, Ep. 2.2. The great epistle presents an enumeration of excuses given by Horace to his friend, justifying his desire to keep away from poetry, that juvenile affair, and seek an activity better suited for senior citizens like himself: perfecting wisdom. The fifth stated reason for abstaining from writing (87-105) is how annoying can be the empty flattery of that literary world with all its members calling each other the Roman embodiment of so and so great writer of the Greek heritage. In this ethical lesson, the poet satirically shows the vainglory of the now great poets of Rome who kept pampering themselves with glorious names to the point of aversion. The title of Roman Callimachus or Alcaeus (probable reference to Propertius and to the poet himself), once attained, brings along only the annoying social obligations of exchanging with your fellow poets the blows of *meros*

¹¹⁴ Ep. 1.3.6.

¹¹⁵ Odes, 4.2 vv. 25-33.

honores, like gladiators with their swords. This section starts the portion more properly concerned with a theory of poetry. It is here that the epistle moves from the conventions of the epistolary genre into those of a didactic poem, first by teaching how to write (vv. 106-145) and then by teaching how to live (vv. 146-216).

But neither Sumarokov nor Trediakovsky made much use of them in their reflections on imitation, at least in this quarrel. The question of translation discussed and put in practice by the two pioneers is one branch of the anxious and ultimately vain endeavour to acquire the glory sought by those now forgotten Roman poets depicted in the aforementioned epistles. Translation was for Sumarokov's Epistles, an activity that should be dealt with maximum care in order not to incur into servility. For him, translation was not detached from the category of imitation. In fact, one thing was indissociable from the other. He meant to avoid a high degree of dependency to models by insisting that the activity had to freely, originally, depart from them, to create an authentic Russian expression of those ancient models. This is how he understood their preponderance in the canon provided in Ep.2.

Trediakovsky, on the other hand, humbled in being outshined by Lomonosov and ridiculed by Sumarokov and the following generations, reacted in the same way in his attempt to vindicate his status as a writer in 1750 with the *Letter from a Friend to a Friend*. He remained in the same level as the authors mocked and scorned in Horace's Epistles, armed only with the rage of Archilocus but not his craft. But in his imitative practice, presented three years later in SiP, he definitely showed more openness with regards to experimentation in forms of translation. By translating Boileau verse-to-verse with variations in metre and proceeding with the Horatian text by maintaining a high degree of fidelity in the most semantically oriented way, Trediakovsky tried, perhaps unwillingly, to humbly reposition himself in the literary

scene and fly low. By doing so, he became the first Russian to produce the first informative translation of Horace in the new language, and if we accept Alekseeva's argument, his was the most widely read translation of Horace in the 18th C.

This quarrel presents some of the theoretical accounts of poetic translations and of imitation in general. Sumarokov tendency to prefer a compositional stance with a freer appropriation of a given model prevailed for a time, at least while translation and imitation were not strictly separated, as seen in the precepts from his first epistle. Trediakovsky, on the other hand, called for greater fidelity to the original text, in two rendering possibilities that would subsequently be thoroughly explored by the many 18th C. Russian authors who used Horace as a model for their own compositions and poetic fundamentals. As we shall see in the next chapter, for his translation of AP, Trediakovsky took the maximum semantic fidelity present in any appropriation of Horace's works into Russian. This failed to be taken as the most popular approach to translation in those times and foreign works were preferably translated as self-standing poems.

The first quarrel in this tradition represented a prologue to the first translations of Horace to Russian that would themselves be the fruits of another literary polemic Trediakovsky would put himself into. Now the outraged pioneer would have to face another challenge, this time by a student of his and Lomonosov's, who chose the former as master. This was Nikolai Nikitch Popovsky, one of the first literary translators in the new language, whose work represented a second generation for the literary system that was rising. A moment when Trediakovsky was lagging behind as a poet. But perhaps not as a teacher.

Chapter 3. Two *artes poeticae* in Russia, or the polemics between Trediakovsky and Popovsky

I. Popovsky and another polemic for Trediakovsky

Published in January 1753 Trediakovsky's SiP had as one of its main proof-readers none other than Mikhail Lomonosov. The polymath was then a member of the Committee of the Academic Press, responsible for selecting and reviewing material for publication, among which the material printed on its periodical the *Ezhemesiachnye sochetania*. Lomonosov reviewed the SiP in now lost comments, but accepted Trediakovsky's compositions in the end. Two months later, in March 1753, a booklet was published containing, along with the translations of some Horatian lyric poems, that included a translation of the famous Epode 2, by then, also already published by Trediakovsky, another translation of the AP, this time rendered in Russian iambic hexameters in a proposal radically different from that translation found in the collection SiP. It belonged to a student in the Academy of Sciences, a young man who attended both Lomonosov's and Trediakovsky's courses on rhetoric and eloquence (*krasnorechie*) respectively and started to call the attention of the great Russian Pindar. His name was Nikolai Nikitich Popovsky (1730-1760).

In 1752 Popoksvy was a 22-year-old student, on his way to becoming Master of Philosophy by the Academic University, the portion of the Academy of Sciences concerned with the formation of new students, which would later become the University of St. Petersburg. His work was supervised by Lomonosov, who would serve the greater role of mentor and protector, recognizing and fostering his talent in the realm of letters. As the son of an important member of the clergy, Popovsky received his first letters at home, and then, just like his teachers, Lomonosov and Trediakovsky, completed his formation in the Slav-Greek-Latin

Academy, during the 1740's. Due to the excellence displayed in his school years, he joined the Academy of Sciences, where his literary talent would call the attention of Lomonosov.

In his short life, Popovsky is best remembered by a translation that would cause a great deal of controversy in the budding literary and cultural field of 1750's Russia: his rendering of Pope's *Essay on Man*. Probably turning it into Russian from a French translation, this Russian version made the young man much admired by the greatest men of letters in the Academy (including Ivan Ivanovich Shuvalov, the great Maecenas of Elizabethan Russia), and was much criticised by the Holy Synod, the official ecclesiastical institution created by Peter the Great to replace the Patriarchy of Moscow, due to the "heliocentric opinions therein expressed".¹¹⁶ The translation ended up censored, engendering one of the most famous and pungent satirical pieces of the century, Lomonosov's *Hymn to the Beard*, where the conservative clergy is mocked in its most prominent feature, the same that had symbolically been sheared some fifty years earlier, with the return of Peter the Great from the Great Embassy to Europe (1798), when he imposed a more modern fashion trend.

Popovsky became professor in the newly founded University of Moscow (1755), occupying the chair of Eloquence. In his inauguration, he delivered a polemic speech, very relevant in the discussion on the formation of Russian language. *On the utility and importance of theoretical philosophy* was read in Russian, and among its points of contention was the assertion that all lectures in Russian lower and superior educational institutions should be delivered in Russian, demoting the authority of Latin as the language of the academe and science in favour of the vernacular. It would take another 150 years before Latin was completely dropped from the exigences of the regular curriculum, but this speech is a first

¹¹⁶ According to the excerpt in Novikov's Dictionary of Russian Writers (Novikov, 1951).

impulse towards the full legitimation of the Russian vernacular in all spheres of Russian society, especially the academic.

He was noted as having fulfilled his duties as orator, something every member of the Academy of Sciences was expected to do in his ceremonial and courtly duties, having delivered in 1757 “a praiseworthy speech on the tenth anniversary of Elizabeth’s coronation.”¹¹⁷ As a poet, Popovsky took much of the transported style of his mentor and did not develop a freer departure from his principal model. His Ode on Elizabeth’s ascension takes much from Lomonosov’s 1747 Ode, including the dominant theme of the current status of sciences in Russia, and how Elizabeth was (or could be) responsible for their renewal.¹¹⁸ Furthermore, Popovsky was a Horatian poet and translator of the Odes. His other Horatian endeavours, especially in the realm of lyric poetry are beyond the scope of this thesis but will be briefly mentioned in the conclusion.¹¹⁹

The young man would cease to participate in the activities of the Academy, two years after being appointed as a member, and would die, at the age of 30, due to [breathing complications/ consumption?]. In his brief life, he showed great potential within the Russian literary scene of the first generation and was much lamented by his contemporaries and subsequent writers,¹²⁰ having left fine examples of translation in the period headed by his mentor and protector. It is frequently mentioned in his 18th C. lives that he translated other ancient authors such as Livy and Anacreon but burned everything up a few days before dying due to what he deemed the incompleteness of the projects.

¹¹⁷ NOVIKOV, 1951 pp. 337-8.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Frate, 2016

¹¹⁹ Cf. below, pp. XX ff.

¹²⁰ Karamzin, for instance, in his *Pantheon of Russian Authors*, a compendium of short biographies of the most accomplished Russian writers up to the end of the 18th C., dedicates to Popovsky a brief paragraph which ends in: “had he lived longer, then surely Russia could have taken pride of his impeccable works.” Karamzin, 20xx, pg..

At the time of his translation of the AP, Popovsky's mentor Lomonosov lived his heyday, both as a scientist and as a man of letters. Many of his most important poetic compositions had already been published (the Night and Morning Meditations, his Ode on the Ascension of Elizabeth, his Ode on the Marriage of Peter and Catherine, his two tragedies) and he had already fully established himself in the realm of philology with his manual of rhetoric, finished in 1747 and published in the following year. This incomplete work provided a great repository of translations and lessons taken directly and indirectly from authors all throughout the tradition, offering clear examples of Lomonosov's translation skills in both poetry and prose.¹²¹ In addition, he had been the great winner in the matter of Russian versification. His propositions and his model had taken the whole Russian literary field, with everyone's adoption of his version of the syllabo-tonic system, that regulated metres such as the foremost in Russian poetry, the iambic tetrameter with alternating masculine and feminine rhymes. Popovsky, having studied eloquence under Trediakovsky and by 1752 under the supervision of Lomonosov at the Academy of Sciences, was one of those who had in the polymath his greatest influence.

As mentioned, Lomonosov was member of the Academic Committee and was responsible for approving all new material submitted to publication in the Academic Press. Trediakovsky had sent his draft to the press in June 1752, when, Lomonosov likely read it for the first time. According to the reconstitution presented by Alekseeva (2004), Lomonosov "had objections regarding Trediakovsky's translation and asked his student to produce a version".¹²² This version was completed at the end of 1752, and by the time Trediakovsky's SiP was published in January, Popovsky's translation was ready. Two months later it was released, and

¹²¹ The work was devised to be divided in three parts. Second part would be dedicated exclusively to oratory and the third to poetry. The whole work would comprise what Lomonosov called *krasnorechie*. One possible translation would be *belles lettres*.

¹²² ALEKSEEVA, 2004, pg. XXXX

it must have been another bitter pill for the poor pioneer to swallow. There was a translation that contradicted almost all of his proposals, rendered in a fashion much more acceptable to the literary expectations of the moment and published by a former student who, one could say, had been co-opted by one of his greatest rivals.

There are no registries specifically accounting for this quarrel, so all there is to it are conjectures, already much more appropriately pictured by Alekseeva in her article. However, I would like to offer some more perspective on the matter, by looking at Popovsky's positions on translation through those in the work of his mentor, Lomonosov, taken especially from his greatest repository of translations, his 1747/8 Manual on Eloquence.

II. Lomonosov as a translator and a case study for the reception of the Ancient dactyl- hexameter in Russia

As we have seen in Chapter 2, the second objection in Trediakovsky's preface was most likely directed at Lomonosov.¹²³ It is concerned exclusively with formal questions, dating to the first polemics started by the polymath's Letter on Russian Versification and the Ode on the Taking of Khotin, both from 1739. The next episode of the quarrel happened in 1743, to be published in the next year and mentioned ten years later in the SiP preface. It consisted in a joint venture, or rather a competition, in which participated the three principal literary exponents of the time: Trediakovsky, Lomonosov and Sumarokov. It took up one of the oldest lyrical traditions of Russian letters, practiced extensively in the 17th-C. Church Slavonic poetry, the paraphrasis of psalms. The dispute in question was to render Psalm 143 in different forms, presenting it in such a way as to the reader to judge the best version. The translations were published anonymously so the reader could compare and judge by himself in an unbiased

¹²³ Cf. above, pg. XX.

manner. The main theoretical point of contention behind this triple translation was the stance on the intrinsic quality of each metrical foot.¹²⁴ Here, however, I will try to address another question: how each one of the authors turned the “original” Slavonic text into their respective version, with respect to semantic fidelity to the text of departure, additions in meaning and imagery, and sacrifices in name of stylistics.

[The probable first impressions of Lomonosov’s in reading Tred’s translation] [Their first polemics. Trediakovsky’s response to Lomonosov in SiP] [background to the polemics on versification.] [The triple translation of the psalms] [A moment to reconsider his role at the literary scene?]

-

But perhaps the greatest source for Lomonosov’s translation skills was his manual on eloquence. Written as the expansion and development of a work refused for publication by the Academy of Sciences in 1744, the *Brief Manual on Eloquence, Book One, containing a Rhetoric presenting the general rules of both [kinds of] Eloquence, that is Poetry and Oratory, composed for the use of the lovers of the science of letters*, better known as the 1748 Rhetoric. As indicated by the title, it is a handbook initially intended to be published in three parts, and after the release of its first and foremost, the rest of the project was discontinued by the author and never retaken in the remaining seventeen years of his life. The scarce information on its two remaining unwritten books leave them only in the realm of speculation, but the first one is a self-contained manual divided respectively in the traditional partition of Invention, Ornamentation and Disposition, prefaced by 10 preliminary paragraphs.

It is beyond the scope of this work to present any detailed account of these features, but an overview of its contents is not unwarranted. The first part, concerned with invention, is

¹²⁴ Cf. above, pg. XX.

celebrated for being the first theoretical account to present “a theory of poetic association in Russia”¹²⁵, and offers an introduction to a theory of *pointe*, the distant metaphor, one of the most important devices used in the Baroque period and foremost in Lomonosov’s lofty poetry. The second part of the manual is concerned with Disposition, or the “arrangement of parts...” . The third part, on figures of speech (O Ukrashniii) [...] Gottsched

In the manual, Lomonosov does not make direct theoretical remarks on translation but presents, along with some original compositions, several translations from Greek and Roman orators, fathers of the Church and poets from many other languages. On the overall, they serve the purpose to illustrate the several points treated in the three divisions proposed. They hardly ever present the full translation of the work appropriated and will be translated only to provide an example to its correspondent topic.¹²⁶ Usually when dealing with prose, Lomonosov prefers to take the examples from other authors, and when dealing with poetry, he tries to provide those produced by himself. This is not a rule though, and in the next paragraphs I want to have a look at one appropriation Lomonosov makes of a poem from classical antiquity and observe one basic aspect: his formal adaptations of a traditional metre that belonged to languages with different phonological structures, and different contexts of poetic production. The metre in question is the dactyl hexameter, one of the most widespread across Antiquity and the many poetic genres therein practiced.

The first appropriation of an Ancient author appears in the section of the 1748 Rhetoric, and serves the purpose of illustrating the concept called by Lomonosov *rasprostranienie*, and *upolnienie periodov*, expansion (or development) and completion of periods. The two concepts

¹²⁵ Among which Orishin, 1966.

¹²⁶ One of the greatest exceptions is the translation of Horace’s Odes 3.30, the most translated Horatian ode and the first ever to appear in Russian.

are defined as “the addition of ideas in a short proposition, that clarifies and present them livelier in the mind”. The “logical propositions of a complete judgement” is the given definition of period, which is completed by the “addition of ideas to their clearer representation in the mind.”¹²⁷ This subdivision of invention intends to cover the different ways to add up material to a given discourse, whether by multiplication (*umnozhitelny rod*) or by amplification (*uvelichtelny rod*), insofar as it fills the speech with only what is pertinent to the ideas expressed. The subdivision is in itself subdivided in the different commonplaces (*topoi*; similar to the Aristotelian Categories). The translation here analysed is an example of development from genre and species (§56) and from whole and part (§57). It is taken from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* 2.1-7:

Поставлен на столпах высоких солнцев дом, Блится златом вокруг и в яхонтах горит; Слоновый чистый зуб верхи его покрыл; У врат на верях сияет серебро. Но выше мастерство материи самой: Там море изваял кругом земли Вулкан И землю, и над ней пространны небеса.	Regia Solis erat sublimibus alta columnis, clara micante auro flammasque imitante pyropo, cuius ebur nitidum fastigia summa tegebat, argenti biforesh radiabant lumine valvae. materiam superabat opus: nam Mulciber illic aequora caelarat medias cingentia terras terrarumque orbem caelumque, quod imminet orbi.
--	---

Erected in columns, the house of the lofty suns / shine around in gold and in rubies
 blazes; / pure ivory above covered it; / at the gates, in the threshold, silver glitters. / But above
 is the craftsmanship of the elements themselves: / there, Vulcan has modelled the sea round the
 earth, / and well as earth, and over her the extension of the sky.

¹²⁷ “Распространение риторическое есть присовокупление идей к кратким предложениям, которые их изъяснить и в уме живые представить могут.” *Ritorika* 48. PSS pg. 127.

Erigida em colunas, a alta casa dos sóis, / refulge em ouro em torno, e arde em rubis; /
o puro marfim do cimo a cobre. / Mas no alto está o artifício de tal matéria: / lá Vulcano
modelou o mar envolto à terra, / e a terra, e sobre ela a extensão do céu.¹²⁸

This is the opening of the second book of the *Metamorphoses*, depicting the myth of Phaeton, Apollo's son who makes his father lend him the Chariot of the Sun after the god promised to grant any of his son's wishes. Against his father's best advice and constant pleads to reconsider the request, the boy Phaeton takes the car, but being only human, loses control of it and ends up scorching many parts of earth, wreaking havoc in the Cosmos. The passage translated by Lomonosov and used as example of *rasprostranenie*, expansion, development of ideas, is an ekphrasis, the depiction of the palace of the Sun, after the boy reaches the abode in the last lines of Canto 1, and before the first encounter with his father.

Lomonosov translates the passage in iambic hexameter, a meter predicted in his 1739 *Letter*, and used by him (and almost everyone else in Russian poetry) in the treatment of particular genres, such as epic and epistolary poetry, but, as we shall see, not restricted to this elocutionary level. Despite the metrical rendering, the translator chooses not to include a very important feature in the Russian poetic forms as devised by himself, the use of rhymes, adopting a stance that puts the translation closer to the didactical, in a kind of intermediary stance between a strictly informative and a strictly poetic translation. To emphasize the didactical approach, the most obscure references are attenuated, as in with Vulcan's epithet, *Mulcifer*, which is dropped in favour of the god's first and foremost name, and *ebur*, with the paraphrasis *slonovaia kost'*, elephant bones, unavoidable, due to the lack of a single word in Russian. The phonemic interplay of vowels in the original is on the overall excluded, and the

¹²⁸ Cf. the translation criteria above, pg. 08.

translation loses a bit of the splendour of the original, also justified by the prevailing utilitarian purpose of the passage. But, as mentioned, Lomonosov chose to translate every poem in his rhetoric in verse and this is the very first one to present a formal analogical approach on how to translate one of the most widespread metres in the classical tradition.

As widely known, the meter used in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, along with that of all works from the epic tradition, was the dactylic hexameter. Possibly the most prevalent and studied of the poetic measures in Ancient Greek and Latin poetry, the metre was used in the Archaic period by the epic poetry of Homer and the Hesiodic mythographic and didactic tradition, being later appropriated as the meter of several other Ancient genres in different elocutionary levels, having been employed in Hellenistic times into genres such as bucolic and aetiological poetry. It was taken up later in Rome with its official introduction by Ennius and his *Annales*, being later fully developed by the Augustan poets, especially Vergil, who used it to compose his three masterpieces, each in one of the elocutionary levels: the *Eclogues*, in the lower, the *Georgics*, in the middle and the best known Roman epic, the *Aeneid*, in the elevated style.

Horace used it in roughly half of his poetic output, now in a very particular appropriation: the *sermo*. In a poetic style that is heavily oriented to a light conversational tone, very different from that detached, lofty voice heard in Epic poetry, Horace started his poetic career with compositions in hexameters, vying with Rome's first satirist Lucilius, considered the inventor of the genre. Lucilius was the first Roman to use the hexameter in this particular conversational way, applying to it this colloquial attitude which will mark the Horatian hexametric production, and the subsequent work of Rome's other two great satirists, Persius and Juvenal. But Horace did not restrict his use of the hexameters to Satire. He later used this same meter and style to treat in the same colloquial, familiar way, another more important topic, moral philosophy, with his *Epistles*, compositions addressed to different friends, usually

personalities of the Augustan political world. Naturally, this also was the meter used in the third epistle of the second book, addressed to the Pisos, that would later be called the *Ars Poetica*.

In Russia the ancient dactylic hexameter and its respective uses according to the classicist genre conventions, in the great majority of times, was converted as the syllabo-tonic iambic hexameter. This was the choice made by Lomonosov and Sumarokov, whenever they wanted to write in narrative-oriented genres or in the artificially colloquial approaches of their own literary epistles. The two extant cantos of Lomonosov's unfinished epic on Peter the Great are composed in this metre, as is the most important epic poem written in Russia, the *Rossiada*, composed between 1771-78, by Mikhail Kheraskov, singing the conquest of Kazan by Ivan the Terrible, which in its preface claims affiliation to the long tradition that starts with the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and ends in *Os Lusíadas* and the *Henriade*.

This was also the meter for the best part of Russian epistolary tradition. As already mentioned, both Sumarokov's polemical epistles are written in this measure, that versifies all the subsequent literary polemic tradition that followed the examples of Sumarokov or Lomonosov. The same Kheraskov wrote epistles of a polemical literary character against Lomonosov. Not only in the polemical mode the iambic hexameter was used, but also in letters to friends such Lomonosov's epistles to Shuvalov, Elizabeth's great Maecenas., passing through Dmitriev's consolatory piece to Derzhavin (*On the Death of his First Wife*), reaching the poetic correspondence between the poets of the Golden Age, the ultimate development and explosion of the trends started by our pioneers. Finally, it was also the metre used for the best

part of the Russian dramatic production, tragedy, and comedy alike, from Sumarokov to Griboedov.¹²⁹

Its analogical appropriation of the ancient hexameter, was certainly mediated by the French tradition, that employed a similar twelve-syllable verse, the Alexandrine, in roughly the same poetic genres, but above all in the shining dramatic production of its greatest poets in the 17th C. Needless to say, in France the Alexandrine became the most important measure, being used by virtually every poet from the Renaissance (although not extensively; examples in Ronsard, Du Bellay, Malherbe), to the 19th C. with Victor Hugo and Baudelaire.

Thus, the Russian iambic hexameter was a very versatile measure, long enough to hold two 6-syllable hemistiches equal in size, musical enough to imprint a markedly fluctuating cadence to the matter treated, varied enough to account for the possible combinations of masculine and feminine endings for both the hemistich and the verse, and representing a most adequately analogical transposition of the ancient dactyl hexameter, having been used for roughly the same poetic genres, in which the best part of its poets practiced their translations imitations and freer compositions. In addition, it represented continuity with other European traditions, especially French, and ended up being taken as the most natural long-length metre of Russian language. Lomonosov's proposition was triumphant here as well, and in the 18thC. this metre shared the popularity enjoyed by the iambic tetrameter, the most practiced poetic measure by the poets of the language. However, this metrical transposition was not uncontested, especially when it came to transposing the classical genres that had the dactyl hexameter as a defining feature, such as the epic.

One of Trediakovsky's foremost metrical propositions was what he called the dactyl-trochaic hexameter, a more direct imitation (*podrazhanie*) of Greek and Roman hexameter,

¹²⁹ Aleksander Sergeyevich Griboedov (1795-1829)

according to his words.¹³⁰ A much insisted upon but arguably failed attempt to transpose the classical epic hexameter into Russian letters, the meter was used in many of his most important works, especially, the *Tilemakhida*, the poetic translation of the very popular novel in their times *Les Aventures de Télémaque*, by the Catholic cleric and man of letters, François Fenelon. The hexameter proposed by Trediakovsky is an ingenious attempt to account for one of the most prominent features of the ancient meter: resolution and contraction, a feature perhaps only effectively possible in a language whose poetic measures are based in a phonology that accounts for vowel length, with the thorough opposition between long and short vowels. The possibility of resolving one long syllable into two short morae and contracting two short morae into one long syllable is a characteristic apparently inevitably lost in languages that transpose the length-based poetic system of Greek and Latin into the syllabo-tonic system adopted in languages such as English, German or Russian.

Ancient metrics were extensively studied by Trediakovsky in both his methods of versification, the pioneer work from 1735 and the revision presented in the SiP. The correspondence between length in the Classical Languages and tonicity in Russian was the central tenet of his poetic theory and this is what made him the first pioneer in understanding and codification of Russian metrics.¹³¹ This first version of the manual was also important due to the introduction of technical versification vocabulary, being the first reference to calque from the ancient terminology such concepts such as foot (*stup*), caesura (*presechenie*), hemistich (*polustikh*), and so on. Trediakovsky's pioneering in the ideas that would effectively manifest in the subsequent Russian poetic tradition, however, ends there. The poetic principles stated to guide the formal conceptions were, perhaps, too narrowly attached to tradition, failing to

¹³⁰ Trediakovsky, 2009, pg. 77

¹³¹ As he puts in the preface, conventionally addressed to the Academy of Sciences, А охотно в том упражняющиеся несколько стихов здесь, доньне в России невиданных, в пример себе найти могут и оные употребить, буде за благо рассудят им следовать, к своей пользе.

account for the natural particularities of Russian language, as pointed out by Lomonosov in his own letter on versification.

In the first place, he did not attest in his first manual, written in 1735, the usage of all possible syllable combinations of metrical feet. Only binary feet were prescribed, and even these were not to be used at will. Trediakovsky restricted the composition of the “Russian heroic verse” only to the chorean foot (trochee), prescribing a trochaic hexameter with caesura in the seventh syllable, not differing much from those composed in the Polish and Slavonic tradition and by Antiokh Kantemir. In addition, only “trochean rhymes”, that is, only feminine rhymes, ending in a paroxytone word, were to be written. Not wanting to break completely with tradition and, thereby, maintaining formal correspondence with the old syllabic system and acknowledging what had already been done in the “new” Russian poetry (Trediakovsky quotes Kantemir as his first example), the pioneer was not bold enough to propose a versification system that fully accounted for the particularities of the Russian language.

The introduction of ternary feet was first carried out by Lomonosov in the foundational 1739 Letter. Based in much broader compositional principles, established in the respect “to what is natural to the language” (his first rule), the observance of the phonic elements that are abundant and particular to it (the second rule), and the critical assessment of tradition picking only the ideas allowed by the two first rules, Lomonosov’s sealed his fate as the Peter the Great of Russian literature.¹³² All possible syllable combinations are attested in this letter and, as well-known, the Russian verse *par excellence* becomes the iambic tetrameter with alternating feminine and masculine rhymes, adopted at first for his Solemn Odes. The subsequent adoption of Lomonosov’s ideas by Sumarokov and the following mockery by the

¹³² As Belinsky puts in his one of his texts about Lomonosov. For a Portuguese translation of the 1739 Letter and the Ode on the Taking of Khotin that accompanied it, cf. Frate, 2016.

latter of everything associated with Trediakovsky, made the contested pioneer make the concessions necessary for him to maintain some of his ground, and dignity.¹³³

In the SiP, Trediakovsky publishes a correction to his 1735 manual, called the Manual to the Composition of Russian Verses, adopting most of Lomonossov's ideas, but insisting in the creation of hexametric verses as the principal metre of Russian poetry. Both trochaic and iambic hexameters were duly described with them both being used in the translations and compositions that formed the greater part of this work. The translation of Boileau's *Art Poétique* was, as said, composed in both metres.¹³⁴ But apart from these two meters, the description of other measures was proposed, the most famous (or notorious) of which would be the so-called dactylotrochaic hexameter.

The dactylotrochaic hexameter is, in Trediakovsky's words, an imitation (*podrazhanie*) of Greek and Latin. It is an interesting solution, that takes a dactylic base, or impulse, and allows for binary trochaic feet to be used in specific feet in the verse. The third foot would necessarily take a pentemimer caesura¹³⁵ and the fifth and sixth feet would necessarily end in a sequence of a dactyl followed by a trochee, as in the Classical hexameter. This appropriation of ancient metrical procedures, mixing binary and ternary feet, based in the rhythmic impulse of the feet, would become the choice for the other most well-known poem by Trediakovsky: the *Tilemakhida*. The subsequent reception of this work was that of a proverbial critical failure but, regardless of the uncouthness of its language, the work presented, in a way, a fascinating solution for the problems of *translatio formae* that poetic pioneers have to face when appropriating the ways of writing poetry from more prestigious cultures and languages. The dactylo-trochaic hexameter would only be used again in the first authoritative translations of

¹³³

¹³⁴ Cf. Above,

¹³⁵ That is, a caesura that divides the verse in 2 halves.

Homer, Gnedich's *Iliad* (1826) and Zhukovsky's *Odyssey* (1849). It would also be used in the first translation of Horace's *Complete Works* carried out a few years later by the poet Afanasy Fet (1883).¹³⁶

But apart from its partial use in Gnedich's *Iliad* and, Trediakovsky's hexameter did not have acceptance at all. Dactylic ternary feet would gain favour much later, being preferred by poets from the silver age, in a moment when the traditional genres, such as epic and epistolary were either completely emptied of cultural significance, or completely resignified.

The Russian iambic hexameter remained the most popular metre for verse epistles and epic poems in the remaining of 18th and 19th centuries. Lomonosov may have been the first to have started this trend, and every instance of ancient hexametric poetry cited in his rhetoric was transposed in this measure. The passage of the *Metamorphoses* quoted above is the first instance of the metre to be presented in his manual of rhetoric and was mentioned here on this account. The Russian iambic hexameter is the longest metre allowed for in Lomonosov's metrical treatise.¹³⁷ Its length of 12 syllables is the main formal factor behind the transposition of the ancient hexameter, even if it disregards the intrinsic elasticity of the dactylic hexameter, due to the aforementioned metrical procedures of resolution and contraction, that would be accounted for in Trediakovsky's proposition. However, the Russian iambic hexameter proved good enough. It was a long verse, with enough room of manoeuvrability, easy enough for the translator to satisfactorily render all lexical items present in the original, avoiding to a certain degree obscurity and subtractions in the end-text. It sounded good and, besides, it was in fact

¹³⁶ Nikolai Ivanovich Gnedich (1784-1833), the first poetic translator of Homer's *Iliad*, in a rendering that became paradigmatic, and a classic of translation, first published integrally in 1829. Vasiliy Andreyevich Zhukovsky (1787-1852): Poet, translator, statesman, Zhukovsky is one of the most prominent figures in the so called golden age of Russian literature, one of the founders of the Romantic movement into Russia. Afanasy Afanasyevich Fet (1820-1892) poet. One of the foremost figures in the "intermediary period" of Russian poetry between Pushkin's Golden Age and Blok's Silver Age.

¹³⁷ Cf. PSS 7, pg.

a sibling to the French *Alexandrine*, which doubled the prestige of affiliation to more influential literatures.

The translation above provides a general idea of Lomonosov's theoretical practice in dealing with the ancient dactylic hexameter, in a context dominated by a didactical approach, without abandoning the verse form, possibly one of the objections the polymath would have against Trediakovsky prose translation of the AP. In effect, this was the metre chosen by Popovsky to render his own version of the AP. However, Lomonosov's adoption of the iambic hexameter in this particular passage excluded a feature adopted by virtually every Russian poet who wrote in this form, deemed fundamental for Russian poetry in his 1739 treatise: the use of rhymes.

Usually, iambic hexameters in narrative and epistolary genres were presented in paired rhymes, in distiches. The same alternation between masculine and feminine rhymes would apply in the formula aa BB cc DD..., continuing thereby the analogy with the French tradition. The absence of rhymes in Lomonosov's translations of the dactylic hexameter in his 1748 Rhetoric emphasize the informative character of the translations, while still maintaining a poetic interest to the text, and due to this feature these translations would be among the only instances when he used blank verse in his works.¹³⁸ One could say here that he tries to adopt a balanced, diplomatic stance, that mediates between the informative and the poetic. The distich scheme severely restricts the form of the poem and for a translation that usually requires a certain degree of malleability, it becomes very hard to accommodate all the semantic content from the original. Lomonosov's use of blank iambic hexameters was an elegant option to balance the poetic features of the original text and the semantic informativeness required in any translation. This was however not the choice made by his pupil, a few years later, when he

¹³⁸ The first anacreontic, a translation. PSS Tome, VII

translated the AP. Popovsky decided for the full iambic hexameter distich, thereby making his translation effectively a Russian poem as expected by the contemporary literary field, and, necessarily, more semantically detached from the original Latin. As we shall see, a defence of blank verse and the first theoretical account on the subject would be made by another Russian pioneer that would end up all but forgotten, Antiokh Dmitrevich Kantemir.¹³⁹

Popovsky's formal choice was definitely a consequence of Trediakovsky's. The opposite perspective presented in both translations is patent by the procedures adopted by each of them. Popovsky probably used the opportunity presented by Trediakovsky of an entirely informative translation to assert his poetic abilities and compose a translation that before anything reads like a self-standing poem. This was the same with his most famous translation, Pope's *Essay on Man*, composed in the same distich iambic hexameter (unlike the original, in iambic pentameters) underscoring the association between the epistolary genre and the iambic hexameter meter. Anyway, in the next section I want to make more specific stylistic remarks with regards to both translations, and show in detail how Trediakovsky's entirely informative approach differed from Popovsky's self-standing poetic translation, a stance which was the most adopted to translations throughout the 18th C., that sought to blur the differences between translation and imitation in a similar manner as that exposed in Sumarokov's 1st Letter.¹⁴⁰ This stance however may have proved less popular to the budding Russian public, since it was Trediakovsky's translation the one that offered the reader completely unacquainted with the Ancient classics a much clearer first contact with Horace's AP.

¹³⁹ Cf. below, pg. XX

¹⁴⁰ Cf. above chapter 2, pp. XX

III. The two translations side by side: Editions and preliminary stylistic remarks

Placed right between his verse translation of Boileau's *Art Poétique* and the upgrade of his 1735 versification treatise, Trediakovsky's translation of the AP served the stated purpose of "underscoring only its rules, whereas the other [Boileau's *Art Poétique*] would display along these rules the delight of [a composition in] meter and rhymes."¹⁴¹ Such disposition possibly showed some kind of hierarchy in the general plan of the collection devised by Trediakovsky. Making clear that while he "could have translated both either in verse or in prose", he chose not to in order to clearly show that Boileau took every precept set down by Horace. There was therefore an openly informative approach to his translation of the AP, opposite to that displayed in the translations of the *Art Poétique*, and many of the translation devices he employs are evidently a way of presenting, in the clearest and most informative possible way, the most difficult and obscure concepts of the original. Besides, by placing the prose translation of the AP between a poetic translation of another very influential art of poetry, and a manual on versification, Trediakovsky wanted to show that he could be as much versatile a translator as he wanted.

There are other indicators expounded in the preface that show the underlying intents of Trediakovsky presented in the preface of *SiP* where he mentions he intended to address a different public from the "illustrated people". He wanted to expand his target audience, beyond the caste that punished his efforts so severely, and even though it is almost impossible to effectively assess his success, there is a complete lack of information regarding its reception, his translation was the first that tried to be entirely informative from the point of view of the semantics of the text. Be that as it may, Trediakovsky used his *SiP* to corroborate several points

¹⁴¹ TREDIAKOVSKY (2009), pg. 8.

in his expressed views on versification, showing versatility in the application of different forms. The translation of AP was one more piece of evidence.

The translation, in prose, is divided in several paragraphs and is appended by 26 notes that seek to clarify specific references to places, people and elements of Roman life contained in Horace's epistle.¹⁴² It is written in a language clear for Trediakovsky's standards, avoiding foreign syntactic inversions, slavonicisms and obscure language. On the contrary, several devices are employed to reach the maximum clarity possible and make the translation accessible to the general literate public. One of these devices, as we shall see, is the extensive breaking up of single word concepts from the original into two or more Russian words. The use of hendiadys is the main characteristic of Trediakovsky's translation, and, as will be shown in the analysis in the next section, is the principal informative element of the translation and the factor that most contributes for its prosaic character.

Popovsky's translation, on the other hand, is poetic intentions through and through. As mentioned above, he presents it in distich iambic hexameters, just like the general Russian practice of converting the ancient dactyl hexameter to this metre, as presented in Lomonosov's translations of his 1747 Rhetoric. The structure in distiches, however, is not without disadvantages. In some points it severely restricts the text and does subtract some of the malleability of the original metre, frequently making additions and adaptations, forcing the translation to departure from the original meaning in several contexts. Contrary to Trediakovsky, where additions are constantly made to clarify the parts that make specific references to the historical context (names of illustrious personalities, toponyms), Popovsky's translation many times simply rubs out the particular allusions, with a tendency to producing paraphrases that provide an oblique meaning, in the name of being poetically compelling.

¹⁴² In Alekseeva's edition: Trediakovsky (2009), pp. 53-68.

Exclusions and omissions notwithstanding, Popovsky's translation is considerably larger than the original, with 684 verses, adding more than 200 lines to the 476 of the original.

Both authors also present notes to their translations, completely different in scope, intention and extent. The notes presented by Trediakovsky, on the one hand, are informative paratextual material, sometimes a direct translation of those present in Andre Dacier's and Sanadon's edition.¹⁴³ The borrowing is not presented by Trediakovsky as quotations, but he mentions his indebtedness to the French scholars in the preface to his SiP.¹⁴⁴ On the other hand, Popovsky presents only three single notes to the largest Horatian poem. The three of them are about literary matters, and, as we shall see, contribute little to clarify obscure passages or add new information a potential reader in 18th C. Russia might not have. These puzzling notes will be treated in the comments below.

As to the editions Trediakovsky and Popovsky used, it is almost certain that they were those brought forth by André Dacier and Noel-Étienne Sanadon, and the same applies to Antiokh Kantemir and his translation of the Epistles, as we shall see in the next chapter. These two translations were among the most authoritative of the time and had many editions where they were published together in the same volume, presented side by side accompanying the original text and appended by commentaries. Trediakovsky certainly made use of them, as evidenced by his acknowledgements in the preface to SiP,¹⁴⁵ and through his own paratextual commentaries and allusions to both scholars. Popovsky must also have had them as their principal guides considering simply their popularity and authority at the time. The question of which specific editions is beyond the scope of this thesis and it may even be impossible to answer it precisely. However, I would like to briefly review the editions of the two scholars.

¹⁴³ Cf. Sanadon (17xx), and Alekseeva (2004).

¹⁴⁴ Trediakovsky,

¹⁴⁵ Cf. below appendix 1.

André Dacier concluded his first edition of Horace's complete works in 1689. His third edition dates from 1709 and was one of the most popular at the time, due to polemical disputes around the chronology established by him and his father in law, Tanneguy Lefèvre (Tanaquil Faber his Latin name).¹⁴⁶ In respect to Sanadon, the Jesuit priest published his first full translation and commentaries of Horace's poems in 1724,¹⁴⁷ followed by a fully revised 1728 edition, which polemically reorganizes the arrangement of the works, according to the supposed date of composition of each poem: the odes and epodes, for instance, are joined together in one single structure, comprising five books of Odes. In 1730 are published in Amsterdam for the first time a joint venture between the two scholars where to Horace's Latin text are appended the translations by both Frenchmen side by side. This edition has the commentary written by André Dacier and had other reimpressions all over Europe. Some of them ended up in Russia, to be used in the formation of its men of letters.¹⁴⁸

IV. The analysis

In the following analysis I intend to delve a little deeper in Trediakovsky's and Popovsky's particular appropriations of specific passages from the AP where I observe the following particularities: 1) The treatment of obscure, referential, or circumscribed information contained in the original that would pose comprehension difficulties to the Russian reader, for the most part not acquainted with the particularities Roman life and poetic background as presented by Horace. 2) The formal adequacy each translator displays in their rendering choices

¹⁴⁶ *Oeuvres d'Horace, en Latin et en Français, avec des remarques critiques et historiques par Andr. Dacier. Troisième édition 10 vol. 1712.* The chronology was disputed by the Life of Horace critically commented by Jean Masson in 1708. Cf. *Enciclopedia Oraziana*, 1998, T.3 pg. 187.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Note XX above.

¹⁴⁸ On the Internet the accessible edition of this joint venture dates from 1735, and, for all intents and purposes, it is the reference used in this thesis. I assume this or a very similar version was the text these two Russians had the access to. Cf. Alekseeva XXX ,

of Horace's hexametric *sermo*. 3) The treatment each translator gives to a very important point in Horatian poetry in general, the *sententia*, or sapiential maxims that serve as a connective element to the different parts of the poem.

For better navigating in the complicated structure of the AP, I adopt as guidelines those set by Brink in his edition and commentary (1971), where the poem is divided in 5 parts: I – Poetic Unity and *Ars* (1-41); II – The arts of arrangement and diction in poetry (42-118); III – Subject matter and character in poetry (119-52); IV – Drama (153-294); V – The poet (295-476).¹⁴⁹ This is a development of the eminent division made in the beginning the 20th C. by Norden in 1905, who divided the poem in basically two parts: the first devoted to the technical matters of poetry (*Ars*: vv. 1-294) and the last concerned with the poet (*Artifex*: 295-476).¹⁵⁰ Brink's more refined subdivision provides a better organized overview to tackle an analysis of such a long and intricate literary monument. This subdivision, and the extensive historical account on the understanding of the structure of the text, might prove useful for a perspective on how the early Russian translators understood the text, fundamentally based in the editions brought forth by André Dacier and Noël-Étienne Sanadon. I shall offer along an overlook on the notes offered by Trediakovsky as paratextual information in comparison with the notes offered in Dacier-Sanadon (1737) and check where he makes the additions to the French commentaries he claims to make.

a) Title

¹⁴⁹ For a summary of the structure as devised in the commentary and its subdivisions, cf. Brink, 1971, pp. 468, ff.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Golden in Davis, 2010. pg. 393.

The Epistle to the Pisos, famously named *Ars Poetica* roughly one century after its composition by Quintilian,¹⁵¹ had right in its title the first differences among the two Russian translators. Popovsky plainly names its by its original name, *Epistola k Pizonam* – Epistle to the Pisos, whereas Trediakovsky displays for the first time his tendency to prosaism and to encompass the greatest amount of information as possible. The pioneer names it *Goratsiia Flakka Epistola k Pizonam o Stikhotvorenii Poezii* – Horace Flaccus’ Epistle to the Pisos on the Composition of Poetry, adding a subtitle, that informs about the translation: *s latinskikh stikhov prozoiu* – from Latin verses into Prose. Besides this informatively extended version of the title, Trediakovsky adds the first paratextual note containing general information about the work. In this first note he reminds something already mentioned in the preface to his SiP, telling us that Horace had taken all his ideas from Aristotle’s poetics, but had on the overall, according to Porphyryon, other sources, such as “Criton, Zenon, Democritus, and especially, Neoptolemus of Paros”.¹⁵²

b) Unity and Ars (1-41)

Lines 1-5: The *Monstrum*

The famous depiction of the *monstrum*, the hybrid creature made up of several animals representing a poem without unity, that opens the AP already marks the differences between both translations. Trediakovsky presents the monster in an very prosaic manner: he translates the contorted conditional clause of the original with a plain SVO alignment, makes additions (*[raznykh ptits] perya / [ot vsekh zhivotnykh] chleny*, feathers of different birds / members of

¹⁵¹ IO

¹⁵²

different animals), and on the overall tries to avoid any syntactic intricacy. Popovsky in his turn is as concise as possible: he starts the conditional clause without a conjunction, but with a reduced gerund clause (*uvidev*: having seen). Popovsky maintains the same number of verses as the original, but this will not be common throughout his translation.

Lines 9-13: *pictoribus atque poetis ... tigribus agni*. The first gnomic expression of the poem, presented as an objection to the conclusion reached after the depiction of the monster.

Both translators eliminate this gnome in the same way: they delete the direct speech objection through the introduction of a concessive clause: (*pravda, ia znaiu...*: Yes, I know that painters and poets..., but). Trediakovsky presents this passage linking with Horace's answer (*scimus, et hanc...*): the would be gnomic expression becomes a concessive clause. The same with Popovsky: he distributes vv. 9-11 in two distiches (vv. 11-14) only separated by a full stop.

The restrictions of the rhymed iambic hexameter distich is clearly seen in Popovsky's appropriation of v. 13 (*sed non ut...*): the Horatian verse is broken up in two rhymed verses, but the division in such a concise manner produces extra space that needs to be filled up with additions not present in the original. The *aves* and *serpentes* of the original become *skvorets* (a starling), that cannot be placed in the same cage (*kletka*) as serpents (vv. 16-17). This breaking up of a single verse from the original into a distich is present all throughout Popovsky's translation and is the main reason why he adds in it some 200 verses to the original.

Lines 14-17 *inceptis gravibus plerumque ... describitur arcus*: The famous passage of the "purple patch" that represents the things out of place in a in an incoherent whole.

Trediakovsky's translation introduces here one of the main characteristics of his prosaic style: the addition of euphemistic expressions that attenuate, and sometimes bloats, the expression of the translation: *odna ili po krainei mere dve blistaiuschie zaplaty iz parcha bagrianovo tsveta* – one or [at least] two glistening patches from silk of purple colour. This kind of attenuating addition is very common in Trediakovsky's translation, but it is another characteristic present in this same translated sentence that will mark the translation style employed here by Trediakovsky: the breaking up of one concept into two synonym words, or hendiadys. Although *zaplaty iz parcha* is not technically an hendiadys, rather it is an specifying addition, this is a first example of Trediakovsky's abundant use of paraphrase and the unfolding of difficult concepts into phrases with two or more words.

Lines 18-23 *et fortasse cupressum ... cur urceus exit?*: The comparison with the artist that paints a cypress in a shipwreck scene and another gnomic expression

Trediakovsky maintains his prosaic posture by putting the two Horatian clauses (*et fortasse.../ quid hoc*) into a single one, in direct order. Here he presents one hendiadys: *po sokrushenii i poterianii korablya* on the wreck and loss of the ship, translating the adjective *fractis*, and a development of ideas: *bedtsve svoyo i spaseniye ot potopleni* – his misery and salvation from the wreck, to account for *enatat expes* [a sailor] in despair that escapes the sinking ship. The concluding gnome, that admonishes the would be poet (“be the work what you will let it at least be simple and uniform”) is not presented as such, as a concluding remark of this section, but as the beginning of the next one, since it starts the next paragraph and links up with the next sentence through an explicative conjunction *ibo* – for, because. Trediakovsky presents the passage as such: “Do it simple and in an unity (*prosto i odnoy po sebe*) because we, poets, in the great majority of times deceive ourselves by the semblance of truth.” Not only

he ignored a very important gnomic expression, but linked up a sentence that may not be read as he presented, joining it to the next section, possibly one of the most famous passages of the poem, that lists the vices a poet might incur if he is too zealous to strive after an apparent virtue of style.

Popovsky presents the passage in nine verses (vv. 27-36), displaying a very strong adaptation of content, with a heavy distortion of the original, and the addition of a distich developing an idea not present in the original. Firstly, he omits *cupressum*, cypress, favouring the generic *derevo* – tree. The word is repeated twice in the phrasing in distiches: let's assume you know how to paint trees [...]; but if you promised to paint how a castaway fights against a wave / what is this tree doing there (27-31)?¹⁵³ But is in the next verse that he shows the liberty that defines his translation: the wine jar that ends up becoming a pitcher by the incompetent craftsman, is rendered as: “why having started with an eagle, you end up in a sparrow?”. This final word (*vorobyem*), in the instrumental case, rhymes with the last verse on this account (*pri syem*). It is not the place to conjecture on his reasons or the pertinence of such an adaptation, but this is a clear example of Popovsky's free departure from the original, that asserts that his translation is to be taken as a self-standing poetic composition. This is in itself a gnomic expression, and verses 33-4 are gnomic additions that prepare the original gnome: “on the thing you started to write, hold up to it, / and do not depend on what is foreign without necessity.” Then (vv. 35-6) he closes with the original gnome: sing whatever you want to sing, / as long as its force is singular and its expression (*slog*) simple.¹⁵⁴ We might give it to Popovsky that the verses were added ironically to create a poetic contradiction that simulates the Horatian irony, but it was a far departure from the original nonetheless.

153

154

Lines 24-31 The vices caused by excessive consciousness

This is one of the most widely quoted passages of the AP, from its medieval commentators and imitators, to the prescriptivists writing in 17th C. Ukraine.¹⁵⁵ This part wholly at variance with the preceding section, a digression, as Brink puts,¹⁵⁶ is a straightforward set of principles disposed in balanced, short periods, very similar in length, with a corresponding number of syllables for each of the assertions. Starting in the second half of line 25, the oppositions occupy the next verses in enjambement until stabilization of the expression and the identification of verse and assertion as seen in v. 27 (*professus grandia turget*). The next verse asserts another opposition and the following three verses present the conclusion crowned by another gnomic expression that closes this section.

As mentioned above, Trediakovsky joins the concluding gnome of the previous section with this, giving it a rather unorthodox reading, especially considering the punctuation adopted by the editions of Dacier/Sanadon (and pretty much any other edition of the AP). The translated set of precepts maintains the balance between assertions displayed by the original, but here the use of hendiadys abounds, even before the precepts proper: *specie recti* becomes appearance of truth and correctness (*vidom pravoty i ispravnosti v veshchakh*); *obscurus* (l.26) – obscure and incomprehensible (*temen i neponyaten*); *grandia* (l.27) – important and great (*vazhnoe i velikoe*); *procellae* – storm and turmoil (*buri i volneniie*). The concluding remarks of this section is the first instance where a gnome from the original version is fully preserved.

Popovsky's version of this section is very balanced in the expressions, maintaining each assertion for each verse. With it he loses the initial imbalance motivated by the initially disarranged enjambments that progressively reach the same verse/assertion ratio. The translator starts the section with a slight deviation from the original: "great part of the poets become

¹⁵⁵

¹⁵⁶ Brink, 1971, pg. 105.

deceived / when judge about goodness by its appearance (vv. 37-8).” The closure of the section keeps roughly the same pace with the original, with the concluding gnomic expression (that in the original occupies one single verse) being arranged, as expected, in a distich also with minor semantic alterations: *si caret arte* becomes “when, someone not knowing any better makes a choice (l. 46).”

Lines 32-37 Example taken from an incompetent sculptor

This is the first instance in the AP where a specific reference is made to a specific place in the Roman environment. The sculptor near the *Ludus Aemilium* that was very good in producing the details, but not the whole, received very different treatments from each translator. Trediakovsky here, faithful to his informative perspective, produces one of the most prosaic moments of his translation: “the statue artisan, living close to the so-called place, the Aemilium school of gladiators, although he produced nails well [...] the statue on the whole was unfortunate and unhappy” (*infelix operis summa*, in another hendiadys). Trediakovsky adds a note to this section. Here we are informed that “Horace means some statue artisan, who lived behind a circus, near a place called the Aemilian School, because Aemilius Lepidus taught, above all, gladiators, where a long time later, Polycletus built a public bath.” It is a note fully taken from Dacier/Sanadon, reaching back to Porphyryon, that abridges two notes contained therein contained, excluding the more extensive exegesis of the artisan that is inapt for the whole that the Frenchmen present in their edition.¹⁵⁷

Popovsky, on the other hand, completely disregards the specific references and insists in his self-standing poetic translation. Here, the *ludus* is brushed aside, and Aemilius becomes the name of the very artisan who “knows how to cut from a bronze sheet each separate hair and

¹⁵⁷ Dacier/Sanadon (1735, vol.8), pg. 88.

all the veins in a hand, but who is incapable of perfectly doing the whole of the statue (ll. 47-52)". He ends the section in roughly the same tone, mentioning the crooked nose, but omitting the beautiful black hair and eyes, concentrating them in the adjective *prigozh* – beautiful, elegant.

Lines 38-41 An admonition

The admonition that poets should choose the matter they are capable to withstand, crowned, once again, by a gnome. Distributed in 4 verses that keep a verse/sentence ratio that could be expressed in 3.5/1.5, with the second part occupied by the gnome *cui lecta potenter erit res (...)*. [Caesurae] Trediakovsky neutralizes this imbalanced ratio, producing two sentences equal in length. By expanding the elements of the second sentence, Trediakovsky weakens the original gnome, giving a rather bloated character to his translation. He insists on the periphrasis of single-word concepts of the original, as in *ordo* – order in disposition (*poryadok v raspolozhenii*). Popovsky here disposes both propositions in the same ratio, distributing it in two distiches.

Trediakovsky's own division of the text is felt here as well. [If one of the greatest commentators of the poem in the 20th C. Brink, placed here the end of the first general section of the text, the 18th C.] Russian pioneer considered it to be part of the same section and continued in the same paragraph the section that Brink would call "the arts of arrangement and diction in poetry". The edition by the French gentlemen, does not break paragraphs here as well, but when they do it, two lines after the division proposed by Brink, Trediakovsky still remains in the same paragraph, proposing his own division. Of course, vv. 41-42 are very well linked through an anaphoric pronoun, the same word ending v. 41 and starting v 42 in polyptoton: *ordo / ordinis haec virtus (...)* It is no surprise that Trediakovsky decided to

consider these particular verses as part of the same whole, [but the section immediately after it are also included in the same paragraph with connectives that give it a logical coherence that is not in the original.]

Verses 40-41 contain a promise that, according to Brink, close the first section of the poem, for which are basically three readings: 1 – a *Partitio*, that will set out the parts of a literary discussion on arrangement (42ff), style (45, 47 ff.) and perhaps subject matter (119 ff.) 2 – a link passage, or a gliding transition between the general contexts of *ars*, to the specifics required by *ars poetica*; 3 – the expression of a conviction in an infallible rule.¹⁵⁸ It offers a kind of table of contents to the following lines, that will deal with ... The treatment of the subject by Trediakovsky

c) The arts of arrangement and diction in poetry (42-118)

Lines 42-44 (45) Arrangement

Brink proposes here the start of the three technical divisions of the art of poetry, the first being arrangement (τάξις, *taxis*; *dispositio*). Trediakovsky keeps up with the original here. He maintains the cautionary expression *aut ego fallor* (if I am not mistaken, then...), and checks for all the key words (*amet*, *spernat*) accordingly, but makes the few additions common in an informative translation (*nadlezhashchee lyubit'* – to love the appropriate; *neprilichnoe prezirat'* – despise the inadequate, etc). Popovsky arranges the section in three distiches, as if the previous advice continued: if you want to write in order and elegantly (*stroino*), then dispose (*raspologai*) everything in order and blamelessly (*pristoino*). He gives emphasis only

¹⁵⁸ BRINK, 1971, pp 123 ff.

to the question of order, without paying attention to the question of the things you should adopt (amet) and those to be scorned (spernat).

There is an editorial issue in this particular passage. vv. 46-45 were transposed by Bentley.

Lines 46-59 Diction in poetry. Vocabulary, pt 1.

The question of the most basic building blocks of a poem, the words. This section, as reminded by Brink, corresponds to the *facundia* announced in v. 41, a question already perceived by medieval commentators. Dacier/Sanadon define the passage as “the possibility of a poet to create new words”.¹⁵⁹

Trediakovsky does not break into a new paragraph here, unlike the practice followed by his French sources. Instead, he links the two passages with an additive conjunction (*pritom* – besides, in addition), as if it were part of the same line of reasoning, and not a new topic. The concept of *callida iunctura*, masterfully arranged in the in the syntax of the original, loses its adjective in the translation and receives a blunt sentence in direct order, erasing the important adjective *callida*: “when you make a known word new through the connection with another one.”(RUSSIAN) Hendiadys in v. 49, to translate *abdita*: *taynoe i sokrovennoe* – enigmatic and hidden. The obscure name for the Romans, *Cethegis*, is neutralized in favour of *drevnim rimskim obivatelyam* “ancient inhabitants of Rome”.

Popovsky (63-70) seems more fortunate in this passage to account for the *callida iunctura*. *svyazat' tak rassudno / chto...* – to link so ingeniously that the reader will not find difficult to recognize them. The “fashioned words never heard by the kilted Cethegi”, are

¹⁵⁹ DACIER, SANADON, 1735, pg. 93.

rephrased, completely omitting the reference to the Romans, saying just that “it is allowed to introduce a word, / even if it was not heard before, and it is new (vv. 69-70). (RUSSIAN)

The rules to the adoption of new words are stated in v. 52. The first is that they be taken from Greek, the language of prestige to be emulated. Trediakovsky continues the previous ideas in the same period, taking *et* (v. 52) as an additive conjunction. He translates it as an explicative conjunction *ibo* – for, because: ... liberty to create is granted, as long as it is parsimoniously used, *for new and recently coined words will have their strength if with some thriftiness they are taken from the Greek fountain and are placed among the Latins*. The last underscored part is an addition. This is one more instance of the prosaism of his translation that might give the impression of a bloated text: Unnecessary additions, joining of smaller sentences into one, paraphrases that attempt to transmit concepts in the most didactic way possible. Although impossible to verify, it might be safe to conjecture that these were among the objections Lomonosov and his disciple would have had against this translation. Popovsky’s proposal to the extract is the opposite: the part concerned with taking words from the Greeks is translated in one single period, occupying one single distich. These measured periods that [match the restrictions of the form adopted] contribute to the opposite to Trediakovsky’s propositions. If on the one hand Popovsky’s translation might seem abrupt, delete important passages for the semantics of the text, or even adulterate passages seemingly at whim, it certainly cannot be accused of the problems Trediakovsky’s translation presents.

The remaining part of this section is the development of the reasoning, illustrated by the most famous Roman writers. Trediakovsky does not offer any notes to the names, which might have been well known enough for deserving introduction. Even Caecilius and Varius, less famous poets from the Roman pantheon of writers, do not receive any notes and are taken for granted. Varius is altogether omitted from Popovsky’s translation, but Caecilius is kept in

the last position of the verse, rhyming with Virgil (*Vergilii, Tsetsilii*, vv. 73-74). In the next distich the name of Enius is also omitted.

The concluding remarks of the section (*licuit semperque licebit...*) are taken as a separate expression by Trediakovsky, in a surprisingly concise manner: *Sie kak volno bylo, tak i vsegda budet volno* – as this was given freedom, so free will always be. The expression however is slightly more extended by Popovsky: it occupies two distiches (vv. 77-80), developing the expression more extensively: *kak nashi pradedy snosili terpelivo, / tak nikomu i vpred ne budet to protivno, / chto novuyu kto rech v stikhakh upotrebit' / kotoruyu narod davno uzhe tverdit'*. since our grandfathers patiently held [sc. to their words], / then no one later will object / that someone uses a new expression, / which another people has already established.

Lines 60-72

The very prevalent image of the leaves, restating the topos of impermanence compared to the impermanence of human businesses. A topos that reaches back to Homer¹⁶⁰ and serves in these lines as a foil to the impermanence of words. The extract presents a threefold comparison with the first simile maintaining roughly the same length in its components (vv. 60-61) and the second (62-69) with first component (vehicle), enclosing a gnomic expression, extending until v. 68, having the second component (tenor) occupying v. 69. A complex simile that includes the Homeric proposition as stated by Glaucon to his foe and cousin Diomedes in Il. 6.146-9, it is arranged in a way that the same referential, or tenor, is shared by two different things compared, or vehicles. It may be schematically represented in the following manner:

¹⁶⁰ Why ask my birth Diomedes? Very like leaves / upon this earth are generations of men / old leaves, cast on the ground by wind, young leaves / the greening forest bears when spring comes in. HOMER (FITZGERALD), 1974 pg, 146.

leaves : words (60 [61, P3] : P4 61) / human deeds : words (62 [68] : 69)¹⁶¹

The first simile presented in vv. 60-61 has the vehicle introduced in v. 60 (the leaves) extended to the 3rd position (first half of the second foot) of v. 61: *prima cadunt*. This gives a trithemimeral caesura¹⁶² to v. 61 and, thence, the tenor of the simile begins: *ita verborum interit aetas*. The next verse (62) immediately takes up the comparison with the impermanence of humankind (*et iuvenum ritu florent...*), echoing Il. 6.146-9, and thereby introducing the second vehicle of the simile.

This unfolded comparison, marked by *ritu iuvenum*, in the manner of young people, encloses in v. 63 a gnomic expression (*debemur morti nos nostraque*). This enclosed gnome gives to v. 63 a markedly bucolic caesura (after the 8th position), with its second half (*nos nostraque* – us and our things) introducing the second vehicle of the simile: the great human deeds, seemingly everlasting, that will not escape ruin and death, whether they are ships temporarily sheltered from the gales, drained swamps that now feed whole cities, or the river that has its course changed which once brought ruin to corn-fields. All these were references to important events in Roman society that took place in Horace's lifetime and represent circumstantial information that may require paratextual material for a more complete comprehension. The extract receives its conclusion in the second half of v. 78, a penthemimeral verse (*mortalia facta peribunt*), to be concluded again with the tenor in v. 79: *nedum sermonum*

¹⁶¹ The two elements of the simile are separated by : . The numbers in brackets indicate the end of the vehicle, or comparing clause. P stands for position, term that I take in accordance to the terminology adopted in Poe, 1974, where a numerical system is applied to the ancient dactylic hexameter, dividing it in 12 parts corresponding to the number of strong and weak positions (arsis and thesis) of a hexametric foot.

¹⁶² Trithemimeral, penthemimeral, hephthemimeral, bucolic are some of the possible positions in a dactylic hexameter verse for its caesura to be placed. Trithemimeral is the caesura that divides the verse in P3 or after the first syllable of the second foot. Pethemimeral is the caesura that divides the verse in P5, or after the first syllable of the third foot. Hephthemimeral is the caesura that divides the verse in P7, or after the fourth foot of the verse. Bucolic caesura, bucolic diatesis, happens in P8, between the fourth and fifth foot in a dactyl hexameter. Trithemimeral, penthemimeral, hephthemimeral caesurae are also called respectively *semiternaria*, *semiquinaria*, *semiseptenaria*, in the Latin tradition. I adopt the Greek names due to broader acceptance. For a glossary of Ancient verse terminology, cf. Poe, 1974 pp. 1-2.

stet honos et gratia vivax. Vv. 70-72 provide a closure to the section, with the key term, *usus*, usage, presented as the principle governing language. In a kind of metempsychosis of words, that picture them recurring like the leaves renovating according to the seasons, it is said that “many terms that have fallen out of use shall be born again, and those shall fall that are in repute, if usage so will it.”¹⁶³

This passage displays utmost mastery in the manipulation of the dactyl-hexameter in a way “that abides to the rules of construction of the meter as much as it breaks them.”¹⁶⁴ The positioning of rare caesurae, the consequent asymmetric periods that neatly fit in gnomic expressions, the crescendo of elements started by the ingenious actualization of a commonplace that asserts Homeric authority, all contribute to the development of this complex simile that makes up “perhaps the most remarkable piece of the *Ars*”.¹⁶⁵ Our translators observed these features and in their own way tried to produce poetic effects that accounted for the brilliance of the passage.

Trediakovsky starts the section with a metered proposition in his translation: *ravno kak na lesakh, listy peremeniatsia*, (just like throughout the woods the leaves are all replaced) is a syllabo-tonic iambic hexameter in its own right, and it offers one of the rare poetic highlights in this prose translation. The pioneer tries to maintain the asymmetry of the original in his own periods, securing the gnomic expression enclosed in the enunciation of the developed simile: *my vse i vse vashe podverzheno premenam i smerti*. (all of us and all *your* things are subject to change and death). The gnome is artfully constructed: *my vse i vse vashe* (all of us and all *your* things), accounting for *nos nostraque* (we and *our* things), translates the second element as second person plural instead of the first person of the original. This could be an artifice to give

¹⁶³ FAIRCLOUGH, 2005. pg. 455.

¹⁶⁴ As put by Poe, 1974

¹⁶⁵ Brink, 1971

to the expression a more totalizing character, that includes a second person plural that may be evocating a recipient of an admonition. Maybe it is a polemical moment in the translation, that makes reference to the impermanence of Trediakovsky's own contenders for the vainglory of the letters. Anyway, the arrangement presents the expression in a mirroring syntactic arrangement that will resonate in the added hendiadys of *premenam i smerti*. These two coordinate phrases enclose the past participle form of the verb *podvergnut* (to subject, to expose), creating an "a b a" syntactic scheme. It is one of the most exquisite treatments of Horace's gnomic expressions in Trediakovsky's translation, a moment that intends to vie with the lustre of the original passage.

The passage receives notes for each of the three references that regard the human endeavours mentioned in vv. 64-69. The first note (number 5), the ships harboured by the winds, inform that "Lake Avernus was separated from lake Lucrinus. Agrippa dug a ditch (*perekopal*) in this place and linked one [lake] with the other in the year 717 from the foundation of Rome, and built there a great harbour, calling it *Portus Iulius*, Julian Harbour, in honour to Augustus, who at the time was just called Julius Octavian" (Note 5). The next note (number 6) informs that "No more than 20 or 30 years had elapsed before Augustus drained the Pomptinian swamp through a long canal of approximately 23 versts that channelled the water into the sea. Through this very canal Horace sailed in year 717 since the foundation of Rome to Brundisium (Brind)". Finally in note number 7 Trediakovsky informs that "Agrippa, following orders of Augustus, made canals that drained water from the Tiber, which before flooded Velabrum and all the fields."

These notes inform about these great enterprises from the Augustan times sung in the AP. They are translations or abridgements of the remarks made by Dacier and Sanadon. Note

5 is a full translation of the note to v. 63 (*sive receptus...*)¹⁶⁶, written by Sanadon. Note 6 is the translation of an extract of the note to the last portion of v. 65 (*sterilisve palus dudum.*)¹⁶⁷, also written by Sanadon. The note in the French commentary mentions the complicated philological issues of the passage¹⁶⁸, and only after a good 15 lines it mentions the specific reference of the draining the Pontinian swamp. The only divergence in Trediakovsky's note is the adaptation to a Russian unity of measure, referring to the length of the canal: *quinze miles* become thirteen versts. The mention that Horace sailed through this canal when he went to Brundisium is a reference to the fact that [...]. Neither Trediakovsky nor the French commentators provide the reference to this specific passage. Note 7 is also a translation of the note to v. 67 (*seu cursum mutavit iniquum...*), written by Sanadon.¹⁶⁹

Popovsky does not present the doubly developed simile as the original, with the first enunciation of the tenor waiting for the subsequent development. Instead, he simplifies the simile by stating only one comparison: the leaves with human endeavours, only to add words as another facet of these activities. vv. 81-2 contain the simile: *Kak list na derevakh po vsiaku osen vianet / i nash dedolog vek i s nami vse umrut* (Like leaves on the trees wither in every autumn / so too our not long life, and with us all shall die). Immediately after come the allusions to the Roman endeavours (vv. 83-85), stated in a very general and proverbial way. No notes are provided for these passages, nor there is any indication that they were allusions to specific works from the Roman world. V. 86 gives the tenor to the simile, announcing the section concerned with words. Vv. 87-94 end the section corresponding to AP 69-72, crowned by a line in masculine rhyme that accounts for the *usus*: [dístico] *upotreblenie schitaia za zakon* (considering the usage as a law).

¹⁶⁶ Dacier/Sanadon, 1725, pg. 101.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid. pp 101-2.

¹⁶⁸ The verse is corrupted. Brink [...]

¹⁶⁹ Ibid. pg. 102.

All in all this is an important moment in the reception not only of Horace in Russia, but also the classics in general. It is a very important passage of the AP exquisitely translated by both Russian authors, each in their own formal guidelines. Both attain to their particular objectives here and provide translations that are formative in both an informative and a poetic perspective. It introduces possibly for the first time in Russia a topos that would be appropriated, developed and reconceptualized by the great names to come. This early instance of the topos prefigures shiny moments in the Golden Age of Russian poetry such as Tiuchev's¹⁷⁰ Listia <http://www.ruthenia.ru/tiutcheviana/stihi/bp/79.html>.

Lines 73-85 (88)

The hugely influential enunciation of the different poetic genres of Antiquity, their attributes and respective founders. The norms of diction assigning their particular form is the foremost concern in this passage, introduced in an abrupt and facetious way, as usual in the Horatian style. The passage mobilizes three elements in the formation of genres and stylistic norms: matter, metre and creator. Only matter will be the topic shared by all the four poetic genres spelled out here: epic, elegy, iambus and lyric. Dealing with elegy, the passage does not mention the inventors of the genre, but states the dispute between the *grammatici*, regarding its origins. For lyric poetry, a divine inspirer is credited with the origins of the genre (*musa*), and its formal constituency, with a highly diversified metric, is represented by the instrument used to accompany its several songs, the lyre. Epic and iamb receive all the three attributes above: Homer and Archilochus the respective inventors of these genres, writing in their [respective forms (*quo... numero; versibus impariter iunctis*)]. The passage is closed in a rhetorical question, that served to reiterate the prevalence of normative poetics in the late-

¹⁷⁰ From October 1830. I reproduce ? пусть сосны и ели / всю зиму торчат

classicist, immediately pre-romantic period: “If I fail to keep and do not understand these well marked shifts and shades of poetic forms, why am I hailed as a poet? Why through false shame do I prefer to be ignorant rather than to learn?”¹⁷¹

Genres and the correct diction their individual poems had to display were one of the most pressing preoccupations of the Russians of the first generation, and classicist poetics in general. Boileau’s *Art Poétique* Chant II. Trediakovsky’s translation of Boileau’s *Art Poétique*, Sumarokov in the Second Epistle will dedicate the . The inheritance of genres of antiquity as an authoritative

Epic poetry (AP 74-75) [SiP ll. 77-78] [Popo. vv. 95-98]

Trediakovsky translates *quo ... numero* in hendiadys: *kakim stikhom i velelepiem* (on which verse and grandeur). The second, added element of the construction is a slavonicism to the later preferred form: *velikolepie*. *Stikh*, verse, to translate *numerus*, metre, measure,¹⁷² is possibly influenced by Dacier’s and Sanadon’s translations to the passage and their remarks on the commentaries to v. 74.¹⁷³

Popovsky arranges the passage in two distiches: vv. 95-98. He also adopts *stikh*, a welcoming monosyllable that neatly fit into verse so as to take little as verse-space/room as possible, but makes a few additions to some adaptations. *Res gestae regumque ducumque* become “the deeds of majestic personalities / victories and wars of heroes in the glorious world” (*dela osob derzhavnykh / pobedy i voiny geroev v svete slavnykh*). The hemistich *monstravit Homerum* is developed in the following distich: “That excellent one showed us all,

¹⁷¹ FAIRCLOUGH, 2005. pg. 459.

¹⁷²

¹⁷³ Dacier, Sanadon, 1735, pp. 24-25 (translations); pp. 103-105 (commentaries).

with this example / source and father of poetry, Homer.” (*izriany pokazal nam vsem tomu primer / istochnik i otets poezii Gomer*).

Elegy (AP 77-78)

versibus impariter iunctis: the defining formal feature of the genre; the combination of a dactyl-hexameter and a pentameter, or doubly catalectic hexameter.¹⁷⁴ Not much to say about Trediakovsky, but Popovsky omits the phrase altogether. His two distiches translating the section (vv. 99-102) will tackle only the question regarding the matter and the disputed origins of the genre.

querimonia primum voti sententia compos: “first [embraced] lamentation then the sentiment of granted prayer”.¹⁷⁵ The matter treated governed/guided by elegy in its unequal verses. Trediakovsky translates the passage as: “first to lamentations, later to the success granted after desire” (*prezhde zhalost no potom i uspekh sbyvshiisia po zhelaniiu*). Popovsky translates: *sperva khot* [...] understanding *querimonia* and *voti sententia compos* as a plain polar opposition between grief, sadness (*pechali*) as opposed joy, happiness (*radosti*), omitting the specifics of *voti sententia compos*. An erroneous, or perhaps oversimplified, understanding of this passage, dating back to ps.-Acro,¹⁷⁶ reads this phrase as *happy subjects*, with a hint “that love elegy was involved”.¹⁷⁷ A difficult passage, possibly a wholly original formula,¹⁷⁸ *voti sententia compos*, an expression of gratitude in the granting of a prayer, it refers to votive epigrams, and not to the attainment of love. In other words it refers “not to a love desire but a vow made to the gods”.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁴

¹⁷⁵ FAIRCLOUGH, 2005, pg. 457.

¹⁷⁶ As stated by Brink, 1971, pp.166-167.

¹⁷⁷ Commenting the extract *Post etiam inclusa est*: That is, at first sorrowful matters were written in elegiac metre, but later people started to write happy [subjects in it]. (*Idest res tristes et lugubres primo elegiaco metro scribebantur, postea etiam laetae coeperunt scribi.*) Keller, 1904, pg. 332.

¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁹ FEDELLI, 1997, pg. 1496.

The passage, however, was read in this way, referring to love, by both French scholars. Dacier in his remark illustrates first the *querimonia* with Ovid (Am., 3.9, vv. 3-4) a lament on the death of his fellow elegist Tibullus, and then completes his remark with an extract of Boileau's Art Poétique *Chant 2 : elle peint des Amans la joye et la tristesse, / flate, menace, irrite appaise sa Maitresse* (It paints the lovers in joy and sadness, flatters, threatens, irritates, appeases its mistress). The passage was thus read by the Russians, with Trediakovsky's generic *uspekhn sbyvshis'ia po zhelaniu*, the success granted after desire. This does not seem to be a direct translation of the AP, but rather sounds like a version of the Sanadon's remark following Dacier's: *La joye d'avoir obtenu ce qu'on souhaitoit*.¹⁸⁰

Iambus (AP 79-82) [SiP ll.] [Popo vv.]

Archilochum proprio rabies armavit iambo: rage armed Archilochus with his own iambus. The metre was at first appropriate to attacks enticed by rage, being adopted later by drama. Verse 79 is sentential in its own right. It includes the three elements adduced in this section in one single verse: author, meter, and matter. Archilochus of Paros, deemed the inventor of poems in the iambic metre, used this form to express his rage (the matter first suited to the form). Then, in the next verse the metre is diversified in its use, and consequently to different matters: [the socks and buskins, attributes of comedy and tragedy respectively, meaning its adoption to dramatic poetry, prefiguring the subject to be treated in the fourth part of the poem (AP vv. 153-294), in Brink's division.]

Verse 76, with its very alliterative *rr.*, motivating anger, rage, is rendered by Trediakovsky as *neistovaia iarost voruzhila Arkhilokha sobstvennym emu iambom* (frantic rage armed Archilochus with his own iambus). He keeps the original *r* alliteration but renders *rabies*

¹⁸⁰ DACIER, SANADON, 1735, pg. 106.

in hendiadys, frantic rage, which somewhat bloats the end text. The verse becomes a distich in Popovsky and his arrangement hints to a biographical note: As Archilochus got mad at his enemies, he was the first to arm himself with the iambus (*na nedrugov svoikh kak Arkhilokh ozlilsia, / to iambom pervy on na nikh vooruzhilsia*). Horace does not mention Archilochus' motivations, and, through this addition, Popovsky points to the background story of his rage against Lycambes, the Parian who broke Archilochus' betrothal to one of his daughters and the poet went on with his iambs to besmirch the whole family's reputation to the point of engendering a mass suicide.

The subsequent translated lines on iambus are also worth a quotation. The metre was expanded to comedy, the low-end of the elocutionary spectrum, and to tragedy, the opposite, elevated extremity, because "it resembled the simple, conversational language, and was more appropriate to grave expression and to acting" (*za tem, chto i prostoi on rechi ves podoben, / i slogom vazhnee, i k deistiviam sposoben*). Popovsky does not address the *popularis vincentem strepitum*, duly translated by Trediakovsky, but the use of *prostoi rech* in v. 107 to translate *aptum sermonibus* has historical significance.

[Zhivov 2005

За тем, что и простой он речи весь подобен,
И слогом важнее, и к действиям способен.]

Socco

[Галл, Проперций и Тибулл](#) в слогe своем гладкий?

И [Теренций, комик Плавт в со́кке](#) поиграли, (Epistola ot Rossiiskii Poetiia k Apollinu Tred. v.)¹⁸¹

Neither translator provides notes for the two personalities present in this section of the AP on poetic genres. The mentions of Archilochus and Homer perhaps were deemed too obvious by Trediakovsky, but Popovsky's strategies of additions, elongating the end text with epithets and attributes of these ancient pioneers, make this a brilliant informative moment in his poetic translation.

Lyric Poetry (AP. 83-85) [SiP ll. 85-88] [Popo. 109-114]

musa dedit fidibus – The muse gave to the lyre (*lira*) to sing the several species of lyric poetry, as systematized by the Alexandrian scholars. Horace mentions four of them: the hymn or a song to the gods and their progeny (*diuos puerosque deorum*), the epinicion, or the songs dedicated to victors in athletic competitions (*et pugilem victorem et equum certamine primum*), the erotic poetry, or the afflictions of young people (*et iuvenum curas*), and scholiastic or symposiastic poetry, the song sung over licentious wine (*et libera vina*).

Both translators render *fidibus* as its more widely used synonym *lira* (Trediakovsky uses the phrase 'lyrical chords'). This contrasts with the traditional practice in Russia to acclimate lyre as *gusli*, an harp-like instrument from the East-Slavic countries.¹⁸² King David's harp becomes *gusli* in the Slavonic tradition,¹⁸³ and it was thus rendered in the poetic oeuvre of the most significant poet in 17th C. Russia, Simeon Polotsky.¹⁸⁴ Consequently, it was extensively used to refer to Greek zithers such as *barbyton* and *kithara* in 18th C. poetry, especially when it came to translate the Anacreontic passages where the instruments are

¹⁸²

¹⁸³ Cf. Ps. 32.2 42.4

¹⁸⁴ *Psaltyr Rifmotvornaia: Gusl dobroglasnaia* Berkov, 1969, pp. 260-266

mentioned. Lomonosov's 'Conversation with Anacreon', is the best example,¹⁸⁵ but many more made use of this domesticating procedure as well.¹⁸⁶

Trediakovsky as expected develops and specifies most concepts: *fidibus*, as mentioned, becomes the lyrical chords, or the chords of a lyre (*liricheskim strunam*); *equum certamine primum* becomes the first horse in a horserace (*kon'ia v ristal'nom podvige pervom*); *iuvenum curas* becomes the juvenile torments out of love (*iunosheskie ot liubvi mucheniia*). Popovsky arranges the passage in three distiches, the longest in the section on genres. The 'muse' is not mentioned. Instead the lyre itself takes up the task of singing the different lyrical species (*no lira na sebia tu dolzhnost priniala*). All lyrical species are accounted for, but the translation inverts the original order: wine comes before the athletic victories in the list of lyric species: the conversations of friends in a banquet (*v piru priiatelei besedy* – Popo. v. 111). The gods come first in v. 110, but the verse gives a slight addition: "But lyre took to itself the following task: / To praise the gods and brave deeds." (*no lira na sebia tu dolzhnost priniala / chtob ei khvalit bogov i khrabrye dela*). To sing brave deeds (*khrabrye dela*) is not in itself an attribute of lyric poetry, this sounds rather like the realm of epic poetry, but this is perfectly justifiable in the context 18th C. Russian poetry.

The Solemn Ode is a classicist lyrical specie that traces its origins back to the Pindaric epinicion, a song in praise of victors, most notably tyrants, in the many Pan-Hellenic athletic competitions of Ancient Greece. Transferred to other historical contexts, this type of laudatory poem came to be an address to a monarch or political personality, to be usually read in a solemnity or ceremonial context, in high elocution, with a prosodic orientation to declamation, or oratory, that sung a particular event in the life of its addressee.¹⁸⁷ In France it was perfected

¹⁸⁵ Lomonosov. PSS, 8, pp.

¹⁸⁶

¹⁸⁷ Tynyanov,

and regulated by Malherbe,¹⁸⁸ one of the main poets praised by Boileau in key passages of his *Art Poétique*. In Russia it became the most practiced poetic genre in the period when our translators flourished. [Alekseeva – Zhivov / Lomonosov]. So to sing valorous, brave deeds in this case refers to lyric poetry, and Popovsky one more time is asserting his translation as a self-standing piece, a product of his own time, for his own time.

Closure [AP 86-88]

The closure of the section crowned by two rhetorical questions that doubts your own status as a poet, if you do not know the ways and rules to each of these genres. This slightly unbalanced extract has its first question plainly developed in two verses, while the second is included in one single verse. The passage, as observed by Brink and Fedelli,¹⁸⁹ represent a transitional passage that summarizes the content stated in the previous passage, and points forward to the passage contained in vv. 89-98. This transition, both summarising the previous verses and introducing a next section was felt as a difficulty by Dacier.¹⁹⁰

Trediakovsky, accordingly, includes these verses in the last passage, as a closure to the discussion on genres. Unfortunately, the edition used for Popovsky's poems does not separate his translation into paragraphs, and it is impossible to know the textual breaks he used in his 1753 edition.¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁹

¹⁹⁰ *Ce vers est difficile, en ce qu'on ne voit pas d'abord s'il se rapporte à ce qui précède, ou s'il doit aller avec ce qui suit.* DACIER, SANADON, 1735, pp. 109-110.

¹⁹¹ Cf. below, Introduction, pg.

descriptas servare vices operumque colores: Trediakovsky places a heavy emphasis to difference between the genres and styles mentioned: If I cannot nor I am able, by the difference of things, to differentiate a style... (*ezheli ia ne umeiu i mogu po razlichiiu razlichat stil, to pochemu menia dolzhno nazvat poetom*). Style translates *colores*, and *vices* is rendered by the clumsy *po razlichiiu veshchei*, by/through the difference of things. Trediakovsky did not follow his French sources, heavily informative in the case of Dacier: *Si je ne sai pas garder tous ces different genres, et donner a chaque pièce les traits et les couleurs qui lui sont propres ...*, and more balanced in Sanadon: *Si je ne sais pas garder tous ces differens caracteres, et employer à propos les diverses couleurs que demandent tous ces ouvrages (...)*. Popovsky sounds much lighter: these differences in verse and manners, if I don't know [them], / why do I take place among the poets? [RUSSO] He accordingly places the two rhetorical questions in four verses, distributing the mildly unbalanced structure of the original into two neat distiches. He also alters slightly the second question: why do I want to remain stupid all my life, / rather than studying to reveal the unknown/ignorance? (*i dlia chego khochu vek lutshe glupym byt, / kak nezheli uchas neznanie otkryt?*)

Styles of diction exemplified from drama (89-118) [SiP ll. 92-120] [Popo. vv. 119-162]

A first incursion into drama, discussion on the appropriate style to each genre. As observed,¹⁹² this passage takes much from Aristotle *Rhet.* III.7, an analysis of what is adequate (*τὸ πρέπον*) to each subjacent matter, or situation. Comedy and tragedy, two opposing polarities of the objects of imitation in the same dramatic mode, serve as the as illustration to what is their 'becoming places' (*locum decentem*). Brink divides the section in 3 parts (*i*: 89-98; *ii*: 99-113; *iii*: 114-118) each corresponding to the Aristotelian doctrine, where *i* would represent the

192

appropriateness of the tone to the given situation the text is expressing, *ii* would be this appropriateness applied to the emotions portrayed, and *iii*, the character, ethos, or the particular characteristics each portrayed person is to display. This, naturally, is not the division adopted by our Russian translators: Trediakovsky breaks the section in two paragraphs, dividing it in two parts (corresponding to AP 89-105 // 105-119). Unfortunately the edition used to Popovsky does not provide the analysis with the subdivisions adopted by the translator in his 1753 edition.

Lines 89-98 [SiP ll. 92-100] [Popo. vv. 119-134] Style and dramatic circumstance

***versibus ... res comica* [SiP ll.] [Popo. vv.]:** the section opens with a sentential verse unfolded in the next two verses in an specification. *Res comica* is rendered by Trediakovsky as ‘comic action’, *komicheskoe deistviie*, much like Dacier’s translation of *sujet comique*. To Trediakovsky, this action does not want to be expressed in a tragic diction *tragicheskim slogom*, choosing this important word for literary matters in Russia, to render the more concrete *versibus*. Popovsky translates the two highlighted terms as ‘comedy’ (*komediia*) and ‘verse’ (*stikh*), much like Sanadon’s translation of the passage: *La comedie demande de ses verses un style diférent de celui de la tragedie*.

***indignatur ... Thiestae* [SiP ll.] [Popo. vv.]:** the development of verse 86. The first two specific references to dramatic particularities (*socco* – the sock used by the comedic chorus) and myth (the gruesome story of the banquet of Thyestes) are brought about in a heavily referential passage. Trediakovsky provides the reader with notes to each of these references, but here particularly, in these vv. 90-91, he omits the references from his translation. Neither the sock, nor Thyestes will appear in his end-text, with the two verses being plainly adapted to “equally any tragedy will be unpleasing if it is rendered in simple verses appropriate to

comedy”.[RUSSO] Popovsky keeps Thyestes in his translation, adopting the informative additions of elements essential to the myth: ... when Thiestes / unknowingly eats his own sons. (*chto Tiest / rodnykh svoikh detei, ne vedaiuchi est*) (Popo. 121-2).

singulae ... decentem [SiP ll.] [Popo. vv.]: a gnomic expression synthesizing the whole passage: let each style keep the becoming place allotted to it.¹⁹³ Both translators maintain the tone but make slight alterations. Trediakovsky seems to be off the mark: ‘each thing shall keep its own decency (*blagoprystoinost*) and be in the appropriate place for each.’ [RUSSO] He possibly expanded the meaning of *decentem* to include a moral nuance to the verb, but it is does not match to the original meaning, even if compared to his French sources.¹⁹⁴ Popovsky maintains the practice and includes verse 92 in a distich with slight alterations (Popo. 123-24), but as a development of the myth of Thyestes recounted in Popo. 122. when you present a tragedy, where Thyestes / ... / then base words and jokes are inappropriate / and the comic laughter does not mix with that sorrow. (*kogda zh v tragedii prestavit chto Tiest / ... / to nizkie slova i shutki ne pristali / i kómichestki smekh ne vmesten v sei pechali*) The accentuation of the word *komicheski* is altered to *kómichestki* to fit the metre.

interdum tamen ... Telephus et Peleus (vv. 93-6) [SiP ll.] [Popo. vv.]: Trediakovsky provides three notes for the more obscure characters mentioned in the passage, all of them translations or abridgements of his French sources. The note to Chremes (note 8), character in Terentius’ play *Heauton Timoroumenos* (The Self-Tormentor), is a translation of Dacier’s remark to v. 94, presenting an quotation from Terentius, an example of how the old man can

¹⁹³ FAIRCLOUGH, 2005, pg. 459.

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Dacier, Sanadon, 1735, pp. 25-28.

get lofty (Act 5, scene 5, vv.) in a comedy. Trediakovsky translates this example possibly introducing the first translated passage of Terentius into Russian.

Note 10 is on the mythological characters Telephus and Peleus, and is an abridgement of Dacier's note, slightly more elementary in its information than the French source. Unlike the latter, rather interested in the background of the lost tragedies, written by Euripides, bearing the names of these heroes, Trediakovsky's note explains who the characters are, the first, Telephus, Hercules' son, the second, Peleus, Achilles' father. The text, mentioning the condition of both heroes is already informative (*cum pauper et exul uterque*), so Trediakovsky was redundant in his note, except for the fact that he mentions the lost play that was written by Euripides. This is one of the moments in Trediakovsky's translation where one could say he wrote an original note.

Back to note 9, we also have an adaptation of Dacier's remark on a topic that Trediakovsky deemed useful to mention. Dacier's note to v. 95, when in tragedy, a "prosaic language may be used" (*dolet sermone pedestri* – translated by Trediakovsky as *peshekhodnymi rechami*, 'walking speech'. Trediakovsky translates only the first period of Dacier's remark, and then goes on to make his own contribution adding the information (without quotations) of another play by the same comedigrapher mentioned in note 8: "In Terentius' Eunuch, Chaerea, in great happiness, says in the end of act 5, that is not shameful in tragedy to present such speech."

Popovsky in the treatment of the passage makes his usual adaptations. He states the addressee of Chremes' rage

proicit ampullas ... tetigisse querella (97-8) [SiP ll.] [Popo. vv.]: a double assonance in the last words of the verses *verba* / *querella* that prepares for the next section, started in a gnomic

expression marked by a very prevalent homeoteleuton (see next note below). Trediakovsky coins a word to translate *sesquipedalia*, words a-foot-and-a-half-long: *poltorafutnye*, taking the Germanic root of the word (foot, or fuß, from German), instead of the expected Slavic *stop*. Why wasn't the coinage *poltorastopnye* is maybe to accentuate the irony or strangeness of a word never used before Horace to refer to words, or simply to maintain the strict etymology of the word, originally a plain unity of measure.¹⁹⁵ In this, he may have coined a hapax legomenon, a word said only once, in Russian literature.

Lines 99-113: Pathos [SiP ll.] [Popo. vv.]

According to Brink's reading, these lines refer to the paragraph on Aristotle's Rhetoric 3.7, on pathos (1408a 16-25). If the expressions are right, appropriate to the emotions involved, then the audience will respond accordingly.

Trediakovsky considers this part of last section. He does not break a paragraph here, separating this from last section, and will only do so in the middle of verse 105, when Telephus and Peleus will be mentioned again. The heroes seem to give the cohesion to these lines 99-113 in Trediakovsky's translation [SiP ll.].

Non satis est ... sunt / ... auditoris agunto (99-100) [SiP ll. 101-106] [Popo. vv.]: A shiny homeoteleuton forming a paired rhyme, enclosing in a gnomic expression a prescription to the adequacy of one's words to pathos, in a quasi-legal language of enactment.¹⁹⁶ It is not enough for poems to be beautiful: they must have charm and lead the hearer's soul where they will.¹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁵ Cf. Caesar, B.G. 4,17; Vitruvius 5.10.

¹⁹⁶ *Sunto* alludes to legal formulae as those found in the 12 tables' law. Cf. Brink, 1971, pg. 207. Also observed by Dacier's remark, pg. 117.

¹⁹⁷ FAIRCLOUGH, 2005, pg. 459.

Trediakovsky's translation is turgid, due to the prevalence of hendiadys and developments: *dulcia*: sweet and useful (*sladki i polesny*), *animum auditoris*: in the spectator a passion from the heart (*v slushatele serdechnye pristrastiia*). No clear reminiscent of legal language in his translation. Dacier also translates *dulcia* in hendiadys, but with a different second element: *il faut qu'ils soient doux et touchants*.¹⁹⁸

Popovsky makes considerable modifications. Not to these particular verses, which are translated entirely in one distich (Popo. 135-36), but through the arbitrary inclusion of another distich following the gnome as if to develop an explanation to it: "this general law has nature given us / in order to conform always the others with the passions" (*sei obshche vsem zakon dala priroda nam / chtob sootvestvovat vsegda drugikh strastiam* – Popo. 137-8). This odd addition, mentioning a law of nature, foreshadows another gnomic expression that will bring the passage on pathos to a closure, that on nature as a craftsman (AP 108 ff. *format enim natura...*).

... tristia maestum ... dictu vv. 105 – 107 [SiP ll. 108-110] [Popo. vv.]: Trediakovsky breaks the paragraph here, in the middle of AP v. 105. This division marks an unity that will be extended until the end of Brink's section on the styles of poetry as exemplified by drama (AP 89-118). The paragraph is given cohesion by the conjunctions *ibo* (because), linking AP vv. 107-108 and *togo radi* thus, because of it, linking AP vv. 113-114, the latter the point where the passage as divided by Brink is subdivided. It seems Trediakovsky's logical unity to the paragraph is in the adequate representation that Nature gives to the each expression in a way that "complaining speech should accord to a sad face, because nature herself represents in us

¹⁹⁸ DACIER, SANADON, 1735, pg. 28.

all the adequation to each situation (...) If one breaks these precepts it will make the Roman citizens laugh. Thus it is important to observe who is speaking...”

format enim natura ... interprete lingua vv. 108-113 [SiP ll. 110-114] [Popo. vv. 149-150]

A gnomic expression starting the transition to the section Brink defines as “Style and Human Types” – AP 114-118. Nature first shapes, fashions us, our mind. Nature represented as a craftsman of the human mind is a very eloquent parallel to the poet and its practice, having been slightly altered by both our translators. Trediakovsky uses the verb *izobrazhat*, represent, depict, to translate *formo*, *formare*, to fashion, to form, to mould, dragging the meaning to the field of drama, as if nature represented us and our minds in the theatre of the world.

As shown in the note to AP 99-100, Popovsky makes additions as if prefiguring these verses on nature as a craftsman. Here he concludes the reasoning started in Popo. vv. 137-8 also in a very particular appropriation: “that beforehand the internal changes happened in us / according to the external – this the voice of nature commands.” (*chtob prezhdde vnutrenni premeny byli v nas / soglasny s vneshnymi – velit natury glas*). The strong adaptation in this translation, with a marked slavonicism, using the non-plephonic form of *golos*, an elevated form, therefore, proper to lofty genres such as the solemn ode, might point to an allusion to a feature in the 18th C. Russian literary field. In this case Popovsky might be quoting his teacher, Lomonosov, in an ode written in 1746 on Elizabeth’s birthday, where there is a parallelism between the monarch and Nature, the “deity” particularly lauded in this piece:

Я вижу тот пресветлый час.-

Там круг молодой Елисаветы

Сияют щастливы планеты,

Я слышу там природы глас.¹⁹⁹

I see it in this shiny hour / there, around the young Elizabeth / sparkle the joyful planets / I hear there the voice of nature (vv. 27-30).

With *natury glas*, rhyming with *nas* (us), Popovsky paid a small tribute to his mentor, in a moment when Nature and its investigation, the principal field of interest of Lomonosov, came to the fore in the Horatian Ars.

Lines 114-118 [SiP ll. 115-120] [Popo. vv. 157-162] Styles and human types. The appropriate style to be adopted to the different characters depicted in a play. This section, in Brink's reading, corresponded to the third category of *to prepon* in Aristotle's Rhetoric: the ethos each character must attain to.

intererit multum... Slight adaptations from both translators. Trediakovsky is more specific "it is necessary to observe very diligently" (*vesma prilezhno nabliudat nado*). All human types are accounted for in his translation with one slavonicism [?] to account for *cultor*, farmer, peasant: *oratai*. Popovsky will alter almost all the types in the original, with no mentions to gods or heroes (replacing them with servant and master [Popo. 156]), or moderate adaptations: *matrona potens, sedula nutrix* becomes honourable woman and despicable slave. [RUSSO]

d) Subject matter and character in poetry (119-52)

aut famam sequere aut... An advice on the choice between traditional or original themes. A gnomic expression that starts a new section on the AP, the last portion of the poem before the

¹⁹⁹ Oda na den rozhdeniia ee velichestva gosudariny imperatrity Elizavety Petrovny, Samoderzhitsy Vserossiiskii 1746 goda Lomonosov, PSS. Tom 8, pp. 147-156.

section dealing with the specifics of drama. *convenientia* becomes to Trediakovsky becomes *prilichnuyu i veroiatnuyu*, in an hendiadys that reminds the Aristotelian precept on the poetics on the verisimilar/probable and necessary. Likewise, the succinct concept *famam* is developed in “story known to everyone” (*vedomoyu vsem povest*) another didactic procedure Trediakovsky’s translation presents.

Popovsky is a bit inconsistent with the original in this part: [...] The subsequent descriptions, however, with some of the best known characters of Greek mythology are mentioned, with minor alterations, in a rare moment in Popovsky’s translation where the translator maintains all the specific circumscribed references from myth. All the six mythical names in the original (Achilles, Medea, Ino, Ixion, Io, Orestes) are maintained with each receiving roughly the same elocutionary weight as the original, with Achilles receiving 2 distiches, Medea 1, Io and Ino one hemistich each, Ixion and Orestes each one verse. The last two heroes receive additional information behind their respective stories: *Perfidus Ixion*, a breaker of the rules of hospitality, when, invited to the Olympus, he courted his host’s wife, Juno, receives the following verse: treacherous in schemes and friendship (*Iksion v vymyslakh i druzhestve kovaren*). *Tristis Orestes* becomes: ungrateful to his parents (*Orest k roditelyam svoim neblagodaren*), somewhat simplifying the myth of the boy who kills his own mother, Clytemnestra, in order to revenge his father, Agamemnon.

***honoratum si forte reponis Achillem* (120)** There is a textual issue with *honoratum*. The word is contradictory to the myth as sung by Homer, since his rage came from the fact that, on the contrary, he was dishonoured by Agamemnon, right on the beginning of the Iliad. Dacier in his remark implied honoured by Jupiter in *honoratum*, a reading deemed obvious by the French

scholar, but not even mentioned in Brink's commentary.²⁰⁰ Dacier mentions rather disparagingly the correction made by Bentley, which amended the word by the epithet *Homereum*, dismissing it as a *chimere de la imagination*.²⁰¹ However, Dacier's fellow commentator, Sanadon, adopts Bentley's amendment, considering it necessary and "difficult to find a more fortunate one", and listing several reasons why this is the best reading for this passage.²⁰² He accordingly used *Homereus* in the text established in his solo edition²⁰³, reflected in the translation presented in the joint venture: *si vanté par Homère*. This is a curious polemical moment in the joint venture by the two French scholars, making completely opposite assertions and apparently leaving the matter to the reader to decide. It begs the question as to the degree of participation the two scholars had in the organization of this edition by their Dutch editor XX.

Trediakovsky adopts Dacier's reading, translating *honoratum* by honorable (*pochtyonogo*), in line with the text established in the French sources, but without paying attention to the discussion presented in Dacier's remark. This is another fact that corroborates that Trediakovsky used the joint venture as a base to his translation instead of taking the French authors separately. Popovsky will omit the adjective altogether and will just translate by the fieriness of Achilles (Achilesov zhar).

***si quid inexpertum... et sibi constet* (125-127) [SiP ll. 127-129] [Popo. vv. 173-176]**

The alternative presented in v. 119 to following an already established myth, creating something entirely your own.

²⁰⁰

²⁰¹ Dacier, Sanadon, 1735, pg. 125.

²⁰²

²⁰³

difficile est proprie communia dicere ... ignota indictaque primus (128-130) [SiP II.] [Popo. vv.]

Verse 128 and its coherence with the surrounding verses, has been described as the hardest passage in Latin literature, having been interpreted differently by many commentators and translators throughout the reception of the AP.²⁰⁴ It poses a great challenge to establish the logical sequence of these three verses, for they may seem at first contradictory, depending on the interpretation of the particular words of the extract, already in themselves controversial: “It is hard to treat in your own way what is common: and you are doing better in spinning into acts the poem of Troy than if, for the first time, you were giving the world a theme unknown and unsung.”²⁰⁵

[Brink provides the following paraphrase to the extract: “Either follow tradition or create new subjects. If you follow tradition do this; if you venture to create new subjects do that. (But [128]) creation of new subjects is hard and (therefore) the method of dramatizing a traditional subject is preferable to that of free creation.”²⁰⁶]

The discrepancy in the interpretations reside above all in the word *communis*, and was already manifest in the two ancient commentators of Horace, but all words in the verse bring their own set of interpretations. Porphyryon reads the passage as *nunc in aliud catholicum et quasi interrogans: at enim, inquiunt, difficile est communis res propriis explicare verbis*.²⁰⁷ He associates the *communis* with the things available from the common stories available to all in the mythical cycles, therefore, associating it with *fama* in v. 120, and not the *inexpertum*. The

²⁰⁴ Brink, 1971, pp. 204-207. For the history of the reception of the passage (barely mentions Dacier’s remarks, and ignores Sanadon), cf. Appendix 1 pp. 432-440.

²⁰⁵ FAIRCLOUGH, 2005, pg. 461.

²⁰⁶ BRINK, 1971, pg. 204.

²⁰⁷

other commentator, ps.-Acro²⁰⁸ *idest intacta, nam quando intactum est aliquid, commune est; semel dictum ab aliquo fit proprium. Item communia, idest non ante dicta, quia, si dixeris, iam tuum est proprium.*²⁰⁹

The difficulty is transparent in the remarks of our two French scholars. Dacier interprets the verse as *Il est mal aisé de traiter proprement, c'est-à-dire, convenablement, des sujets communs, c'est-à-dire, des sujets inventez et qui n'ont aucun fondement ni dans l'Histoire, ni dans la Fable.*²¹⁰ In other words, Dacier understands *communia* not as the common stock of myth available to everyone who decides to undertake the poetic activity, or the *fama* from v. 119, but quite the contrary, as the *inexpertum*, of v. 125. In this, he follows the understanding of a scholiast to Ps.-Acro (and the whole hermeneutic tradition affiliated to this reading., cf. note XXX). Dacier however understands *proprie* not as particular “one’s own”, but as the impersonal expression conveniently, properly, making the difficulty to the other words in the verse: *Mais je vous avertis qu’il est très mal-aisé de traiter proprement et convenablement des caracteres, qui sont à tout le monde, et que tout le monde peut inventer.*²¹¹

Sanadon in his remark to the passage does not seem to address clearly the matter: C’est a dire, qu’il n’est pas aisé de former à ces personages d’imagination des caracteres particuliers et cependant vraisemblables.

In his translation he seems more inclined to the first position, represented by the reading of Porphyryon: *Mais il n’est pas aisé de traiter d’une maniere peu commune ces sujets communs et que tout le monde peut tirer de son fond. S*

²⁰⁸ Actually a scolion to the text. [...]

²⁰⁹ That is, untouched. For since it has not been touched by anyone, it is common. Once it has been said by anyone, it becomes particular. Likewise (in other words), *communia*, that is, not said before, because if you say it, then it is your property.

²¹⁰ It is not easy to treat properly, that is, conveniently, common subjects, that is, invented subjects that has no historical and mythological basis.

²¹¹ DACIER, SANADON, 1725, pg 30.

These difficulties could not be unaccounted for in the translations of our Russian pioneers. Trediakovsky's translation affiliates his interpretation to the first group, identifying *communia* with *famam*, or the themes shared by everybody: "Although it is difficult to excel [in] (*otlichit*) a matter generally written by many with one's own composition (*sobstvennym sochineniem*), you however will more perfectly present to the scene the well-known story of Troy, than to propose something unknown and never before written." (*khotia i trudno obshche mnogimi opisanuiu materiiu sobstvennym otlichit sochineniem, odnako vy ispravnee mozhet Troianskuii vedomuii povest predstavliat deistviem, nezheeli predlagat neizvestnoe i prezhe ne opisanoe*).

Popovsky's translation is rather obscure. He heavily adapts his text and it is difficult to understand exactly what he means: "it is a very hard business to brighten a new expression / so that it receives in it the summit of praise who can". (*vesma tiazhely trud – tak novy skrasit slog, / chtob v onom poluchit verkh pokhvaly, kto mog*).

Lines 131-52 How to make a traditional subject the poet's own: Homer [SiP ll.] [Popo. vv.]

A central section in the AP, containing key poetic terminology at the end of the first third of the poem. Above all, it is a section concerned with the vicissitudes of poetic originality in an authority-oriented, imitative, literary paradigm, and certainly was one of the most relevant in the development of the theoretical basis of the poet-prescriptivists from the modern classicist times.

publica materies privati iuris erit (131) Trediakovsky includes this section in the last paragraph, beginning in v. 128, extending until v. 135.

***nec verbo ... fidus / interpres* (133-4)** The *fidus interpres*, or faithful translator, that in the emulation of poets and works from a more prestigious culture, does nothing but rendering artlessly the meaning of the original composition. In other words, the traditional subject, mentioned in the previous section, is not rearranged artfully enough to become personal and, therefore, assert its own prerogatives for authority. This is a relevant part of the polemics already treated in Chapter 2, having been directly emulated by Sumarokov in his Epistle 1, listing the servile and formally foreignizing stances adopted some authors in Russian, among which Trediakovsky may have been targeted.

***scriptor cyclicus* (136)** Trediakovsky breaks here the paragraph started in his translation in AP v. 128 (*difficile est proprie communia dicere* [...]). The break is the same as that adopted in Sanadon's translation, except that the Jesuit priest starts his division way earlier, all the way back to v. 119, *aut famam sequere* [...].

Trediakovsky provides two notes here for the passage. The first (Note 11), commenting on *scriptor cyclicus*, the second (Note 12) on the beginning of poem he would have written. *Cyclicus* is a technical term that refers to Aristotle poetics, in a unfavourable treatment of other more verbose poets that took on the Trojan cycle without the due measure of unity,²¹² also present in a famous epigram by Callimachus, that served as motto to Odes 3.1.²¹³ Note 11 is a translation of an extract of Sanadon's remark on *Scriptor cyclicus* that conjectures that this writer might have been a Roman. After explaining the vices this writer on Priam's life had incurred, Sanadon and Trediakovsky point to two other extant works as comparison with other

²¹² Poet.

²¹³ Ant. Palat. 12.43: *ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν...* (I hate the cyclical poem...), cf. Odes 3.1.1 *Odi profanum vulgum et arceo*... (I shun the uninitiated crowd and keep distance). RUDD, 2004 pg. 141.

writers, now much more famous Roman poets, that would have broken the precepts set by Horace and incurred in these faults. I quote Trediakovsky:

Некто из древних римских пиитов, коего имени Гораций нам не объявляет, сочинил поэму о Троянской войне, где он вел всю Приамову историю порядком от рождения его до смерти, не отступая ни к какому эпизодию. Таковы точно поэмы «Превращения» Овидиевы и «Ахиллеида» Стациева. Единство героев и действия не находится в первом, а второй хотя и предлагает действия одного токмо героя, но действия сии не связываются между собою и не клонятся к одному главному, которому б их все соединить.

“Someone from the ancient Roman poets, whose name Horace does not reveal, composed a poem on the Trojan war where he recounted all Priam’s history in order from his birth to his death, without skipping not even a single episode. Such are exactly the poems “Metamorphoses”, by Ovid and the “Achilleid” by Statius. The unity of heroes and action is not found in the first one, and in the second, even though the actions of a single hero is arrayed, these actions are not linked one with the other and do not convened to a main one that would unite then all.”²¹⁴

The other note, on the quotation of this bad poet, is a adaptation of the same remark by Sanadon, where Trediakovsky makes a few additions of his own to better inform the reader as who the aforementioned Statius and his work on Achilles are. In the note we are offered the first two-and-a-half lines of the Achilleid, being one more time the first time these verses were translated into Russian. Here we also find a literal explanation of the word *cyclicus* and his

²¹⁴ Cf. with Sanadon’s remark: *Un ancien poète Romain, dont Horace nous à laisser ignorer le nom, avoit fait un poème sur la guerre de Troie, où il prénoit toute l’histoire de Priam, depuis sa naissance jusqu’à sa mort, sans y mêler aucun épisode. De ce genre sont les metamorphoses d’Ovide et l’Achilleide de Stace. L’unité de héros et d’action ne se trouve point dans le premier de ces poèmes; le second se borne aux actions d’un seul home [sic], mais ces actions sont indépendentes les unes des autres, et ne tendent point à une action principale qui puisse les réunir toutes.* DACIER, SANADON, 1735, pg. 137.

choice of translation. After clarifying that *cyclicus* means *krugovoi* (round, circular), he states that his choice to translate the word as *ploshchadnoy*. The translation to *scriptor cyclicus olim* thus becomes *ploshchadnoi v drevnie vremena pisatel*, or a vulgar, base, writer from ancient times, in an adjective derived from the word *ploshchad*, court, street square, but used in several other polemical instances in the linguistic debate of the new Russian language.

Trediakovsky's writer could be at first understood as a vulgar, vile element, omitting the idea of someone who writes dull and unnecessarily long poems, but someone who debases the language by adopting vulgar language, proper of a street vendor. However, the use of the word *ploshchadnoi* by Trediakovsky in this context, could be understood in a different way from this socio-linguistic criterion. As Zhivov points out, referring exclusively to grammatical issues of the new Russian language that was being formed, the several times Trediakovsky used the term to refer disparagingly especially to Sumarokov, he was referring not to the linguistic forms used by the lowest elements of society, but to a language not governed by the rationalistic principles of language based on "grammatical reason".²¹⁵ Extending the argument to literary theory, Trediakovsky, with this choice of adjective to translate *cyclicus*, might have had also in mind the construction of plots not founded upon the rationalistic principles that governed the conceptions of early-classicist Russian linguistic theory. For him the ancient cyclic writer is *ploshchadnoi* because he would not observe the criteria of unity in the composition of poems, according to the good usage of rationalistic literary practices.

However, the stint of a language from the riff-raff in the choice of this adjective is impossible to remove completely. If those writers who do not observe the rules of a proper literary composition are being compared to writers from the masses writing to the masses, perhaps this could point to popular scenic practices of the time. Trediakovsky uses the word in

²¹⁵ Zhivov, 2005, pp. 05 ff.

another section of his SiP to refer to the theatre: “However, base and street-level words (*podlye i ploshchadnye slova*) are not often accepted in the theatre, if they are not fixed (emphasised *podkrepleny*) by some kind of reason.”²¹⁶ The passage is taken from his *Reflections of Comedy in General*, in a moment when he quotes from the Jesuit writer René Rapin’ *Reflexions sur la poétique d’Aristote et sur les ouvrages des poètes anciens et modernes* (1676).

[...]

Another hypothesis for this choice of adjective is that it has polemical implications. Complementing it with *v drevnye vremena* (of old, from ancient times), would he imply, besides the simple rendering of *olim*, a polemical opposition with a *ploshchadnoy v nastoiashchie vremena pisatel*, a base writer from the present?

It is also interesting to note another peculiarity of Trediakovsky’s translation of the first line of the Horatian *scriptor cyclicus*: *ia vospoiu Priamovu fortunū i blagorodnuiu bran* (I shall sing Priam’s *fortune* and the noble struggle). With the borrowing of a patently Latin word, *fortuna*, in a quotation of a representatively bad author, Trediakovsky feigned a characteristic observed by the linguistic reflections of all our pioneers in this particular moment of the development of a Russian literary language, the proscription of gratuitous borrowings from other languages when there is the possibility to express the same concepts in words available in a Russian or Slavonic substrate. Fending off borrowed terms from other European languages had become by this moment in the linguistic consciousness of our literary pioneers a necessity, a matter of assuring the ever more pressing issue of preserving linguistic purity and, therefore, asserting the authority of the new literary language in face of its European, by then more

²¹⁶ Однако подлые и площадные слова не должны быть позволены на театре, ежели они не будут подкреплены некоторым родом разума. Trediakovsky, 2009, pg. 259. Kutina, Sorokin et al., 2013 (Tom 20), pp. 45-6.

developed, counterparts.²¹⁷ Trediakovsky is effectively lending a vicious linguistic behaviour to a writer characterized by an adjective typical of those accused of breaching the norms of appropriate language usage, in a moment when the linguistic consciousness for correctness and decorum was more intense than ever.

Popovsky on his turn translates *scriptor cyclicus* as *lekhky pisatel* (light writer), but the following verse, preparing the quotation, develops his character:

“Do not follow the light writer’s example / wandering through the marketplace, he was praised (bragged) beyond due measure: / ‘the terrifying struggle I shall write, the bitter lot of heroes / the fall of strong warriors, Priam’s misfortune’ / each though for him, he endeavoured with beauty / to leave all authors far behind him / but he, like a battered horse could not complete a verst, / already extenuated by the race, he shivered and fell down.”²¹⁸

These verses translate the whole passage concerned with the *scriptor cyclicus* (AP 136-139), and we can see here the usual degree of adaptation in Popovsky’s translation for the subsequent verses as well, especially v. 139, the famous *ridiculus mus* gnome. Here the ridiculous mouse becomes a horse that promised too much and accomplished too little, but in Popo. v. 192 is found a more important rendering to the present discussion. Just like *cyclicus* was translated by Trediakovsky as *ploshchadnoi*, base, street-level, so Popovsky offered a development to his ‘light writer’: he wandered through the marketplaces. He was also *ploshchadnoy*: however this use is interpreted, whether influenced by Trediakovsky’s appropriation, or it is certain that the association with popular, street language was perceived as an over simplification that was removed from the learned, conscientiously developed kind of language that represented the ideal of the new language that was heading toward a stage of

²¹⁷ Ibid, pp. 237- . This admonition against borrowed terms and foreign syntax was already observed in Sumarokov’s Epistle I, cf. above pp. XX.

²¹⁸ Cf. Appendix X below.

development where one now could clearly perceive different elocutionary and prestigious levels of stylistic differentiation.

***parturient montes ... ridiculus mus* (AP 139)** One of the most (mis)quoted adages from the AP, reaching even the meagre repertoire of wretched corrupt judge-politicians in the grievous contemporary Brazilian political scenery.²¹⁹ The verse is an adaptation of a Greek proverb common in Hellenistic times and alludes to the failed expectations of an overtly announced endeavour.²²⁰ Popovsky's appropriation has been mentioned already: the mouse becomes a horse that does not match the boasted promises. Trediakovsky's translation hits the mark, but does not quite deliver a proverbial expression: he does not seamlessly transition to the proverb, answering directly the question asked in AP v. 138 with a *nichego* (nothing) before taking up the proverb, expressed clumsily with repetitions and (of the verb *rodit*, to give birth, generate) and a paraphrase to account for *ridiculus*: the mouse becomes 'worthy of laughter' (*smekha dostoinaia mysh*).

***dic mihi ... vidit et urbes* (AP 141-2)** A translation with slight abbreviations of the three first verses of Homer's *Odyssey*. These three verses are translated to fit into two, and are more concerned with proving the point of Homer's quality in regards to the unity of action. So important adjectives are left out, such as the epithet *polytropon*, many-sided, crafty, versatile, complicated in the great most recent translation by Emily Wilson. Trediakovsky adds a note to explain that Horace abridged the three Homeric verses, add them in the original Greek and translate them directly to Russian. The translation he offers is the following:

²¹⁹ Hasegawa, 2018, for a brilliant scholarly analysis of a misquotation by judge Sérgio Moro, on the occasion of

...
²²⁰ Brink,

«Возвести мне, Муза, многообратившегося (мудрого, благоразумного) мужа, который, странствовав чрез долгое время по разорении священной Трои, познал нравы и был в градах многих народов».

(extoll, Muse, the multiversatile (wise, judicious) man, who after roaming for a long time after the destruction of sacred Troy, got acquainted with customs and cities of many peoples.)

This note is another moment when Trediakovsky includes extracts of relevant ancient authors and translates them, introducing unprecedented excerpts into the new Russian language. These brief translations of Homer were also the first extract when Homer was translated into Russian, and one more time Trediakovsky could assert his pioneering work.²²¹

Popovsky presents the translation in 2 distiches (Popo. 201-204):

«Скажи, о муза, мне о славном муже том,
Что, в пепел обратив Приамов гордый дом,
Изведал на пути народов нравы многих,
Повсюду странствуя Небес веленьем строгих»

Tell me, o Muse, about that glorious man who, / having turned the proud palace of Priam to ashes, / got acquainted on his way the habits of many peoples, /

Thus ends the first part of the Trediakovsky's and Popovsky's translations of the AP. Due to the limits imposed by circumstances I could not carry out a complete analysis of their

²²¹ The first integral translation of the Odyssey was effected by Vasily Zhukovsky in 1849.

translations and I should leave it only concerning first section of the poem. However, I think that a few conclusions could be reached in it.

About Trediakovsky, his principal intention was to show he could be versatile in the command of different forms and presented in the opening of his SiP one poetic translation varying in the choice of meter, one prose translation, Boileau's *Art Poétique* and a prose strictly informative translation of the AP for matters of variety. Thus, Trediakovsky would present himself as the most varied *législateur* of his language, thereby asserting the priority he wished to attain in his anxious purposes. Prose translations, however, were not a common or even an accepted practice and Popovsky with his translation mocks this approach by producing a translation that goes the opposite direction from Trediakovsky's approach. Popovsky's translation follow the practice favoured in his times of a self-standing literary translation that should present poetic relevance. In this wise he affiliates himself to Lomonosov.

But if we take Trediakovsky's translation in the context of his SiP, arranged between the translation a poetic art that sought to show how his author could be diversified and the re-examination of his method on poetic forms, it represented the middle ground between a poetic text (*Art Poétique*) and a fully theoretical one (*Sposob*). The translation of AP is written in an epistolary style as much prosaic as possible still reflected old conceptions regarding the nature of the text that stretch back to the middle-ages and was still treated as a manual, but it was treated intermediary and had the incoherencies and lack of order of the epistle, essentially a poetic text, dully accommodated.

The translation, nevertheless, represented the extremity of how a poetic text could be treated in 18th C. Russia. A translation subservient to the semantics of the text, essentially governed by a didactic approach, whose main objective is to teach by acquainting the reader

with a culture strange to him (Roman) and serve as an ancillary tool to a fully poetic text in the scope of his work (*Art Poétique*).

Trediakovsky and Popovsky's translations represented two extremities in the types of translation possible when it comes to a poetic text. In the next chapter we shall see another translation that could be placed in a middle ground between Trediakovsky and Popovsky's productions. This translation, despite receiving almost no attention upon its production, it showed the prowess in translation of another pioneer of Russian literature: Antiokh Dmitrievich Kantemir.

Chapter 4 - Kantemir's epistles

The other main character of this thesis is prince Antiokh Dmitrevich Kantemir. His role as translator and poet heavily influenced by Horace's must include his name in any consideration on the early modern reception of Horace in Russia. Kantemir translated Horace's two books of Epistles, the philosophical didactical poems concerned above all with "living right" (*recte vivere*). Kantemir's choice was not fortuitous. In the preface he provides for his translation (published in St. Petersburg in 1744), he states that chose the Epistles were due to their being "the most abundant in ethical precepts" and that "almost every line contains a useful precept for the establishment of a lifestyle." Thus, Kantemir emphasizes the pedagogical character of these hexametric letters, preferring them for their foundational character. It is by asserting the role of the Roman poet as a teacher of mores and "what is right"²²² that Kantemir chooses his source text to inform the budding Russian culture.

In view of the lack of information on such a neglected literary figure, I shall start this chapter with some biographical remarks on Kantemir's life, before moving to the consideration of his theoretical positions on versification, which produced one of the most peculiar translations of the ancient classics written in Russian language.

1. Biographical Remarks

Antiokh Dmitrievich Kantemir (1708-1744) is one of the founding fathers of Russian literature, despite not usually being included in the first generation of Russian poets. First man of letters to write satires in a language already resembling modern Russian, but still composing

222

in the old metrical forms inherited from Church Slavonic and Polish, Kantemir is best represented by the maxim quoted by Belinsky in his principal article about the poet: “Russian literature starts with Lomonosov, but the History of Russian literature must start with Kantemir.”²²³ The precocious diplomat who came of age in the late Petrine years and lived the latter half of his brief life abroad, representing the Russian Empire, first in London and afterwards in Paris, was the youngest son of the great Moldavian personality Dmitri Cantemir²²⁴ (1673-1723). His father was once *Hospodar*²²⁵ of Moldavia, a former vassal to the Ottoman Empire and, after his defection to Russia and pledge to Peter the Great, became Great Prince (*Veliki Knyaz*), Senator and member of the Privy Council of the Russian Empire. Antiokh was the fourth son of this towering figure in the in the history of Moldova, who played a pivotal role in increasing Russian influence in the region and in the ultimately disastrous Pruth Campaign for Peter the Great.

Dmitri Cantemir was also one of the greatest polymaths of his time, having written several books on History, Geography, Natural Philosophy, Religion, Music, and other subjects. A hyperpolyglot, he is said to have mastered nine languages, among which, Turkish, Arabic, Greek, Latin, Russian and French. He is the author of the highly influential History of the Growth and Decay of the Ottoman Empire (*Historia Incrementorum atque Decrementorum Aulae Othomanicae*, 1716), allegedly one of the sources of inspiration to Gibbon’s Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.²²⁶ All these accomplishments made the man highly esteemed in the academic and intellectual circles of Europe, earning him a membership in the Academy of Sciences of Berlin and making him an important agent in the formative years of the Academy

²²³ Belinsky,

²²⁴ Derived from Moldovan/Romanian, name Cantemir x Kantemir.

²²⁵ Hospodar. Title given to the Moldovan Ruler appointed by the

²²⁶

of Sciences of St. Petersburg. His youngest son, Antiokh had certainly a fertile ground on which to develop his talents, showing since his young age great capacity for linguistic undertakings.

Cantemir was the son of *Hospodar* Konstantin Cantemir, the first of his name to take the position, appointed by the Ottomans of governor of Moldova. When he was 14 years old, Dmitri was sent to Constantinople as a hostage in the Sultan's palace, following the common practice of sending the sons of provincial governors to the capital as a "retainer". In the four years he would spend there, he received most of his education in the Greek-orthodox school of Constantinople, getting in touch with the best minds the Greek community Ottoman Constantinople had to offer. In addition, he got proficient in Arabic and Turkish, learned its music and amassed all the information he would later use in the History of his former lords. After these formative years, Dmitri returned to Moldova, where he took the position of his recently deceased father and pledged fidelity to the Porte. His popularity among the Moldavians raised concern among his lords and he was forced back to Constantinople. On the 10 (21) of September 1709, Antiokh was born.

It is worth remembering that the boy was born only three months after the most important military event for the Petrine era and the Russian Empire as a whole: the Battle of Poltava. After the virtual annihilation of the Swedish army, its king, Charles XII, took refuge with the Ottomans. One year later, after the demands for the Turks to hand over this illustrious guest fell on deaf ears, the Russian army attacked, and there started another episode within the Great Northern War, the Russian-Ottoman war of 1710-11, also known as the Pruth Campaign. It was in this context that in April of 1711 Dmitri Cantemir betrayed the Turks and pledged allegiance to Peter the Great. Moldova would offer assistance to Russia and, "in the remote

case of its capture to the enemy, its ruler would be received into the Tsardom as a refuge with all his prerogatives vouchsafed.”²²⁷

Sadly for the Moldovans and the future Russian Empire, the campaign ended up a complete disaster that almost led the very Tsar of Russia into captivity. The campaign forced Peter to renounce his earlier conquests from the Ottomans (including its Southern fleet and the only access the realm had to a warm-water port at the Sea of Azov), consolidate the former borders between the two States, assure the safe return of Charles XII to Sweden, and hand over the traitor Dmitri Cantemir. All the conditions were duly met by the Russians except the last one. The fidelity shown to Peter and possibly the friendship developed between these two great men granted the safety and recognition of Dmitri and his family in Russia.

Being made a prince, Cantemir now had an opulent estate in Russia and all the time he needed to pursue his intellectual ambitions. From 1713 to 1719 he and his family lived in Moscow, moving afterwards to St. Petersburg, where he ended his life four years later on his way back from the last military enterprise of Peter the Great, the Russo-Persian War of 1722-23. In these remaining years he would attain worldwide recognition, being made honorary member of the Academy of Sciences of Berlin, and one of the names behind the establishment of the Academy of Sciences of St. Petersburg. It is likely he would have been made its first president, were it not for his death two years before the establishment of the institution.²²⁸ This was the context in which the young Antiokh was brought up. When he moved with his family to the new great city founded by Peter, the Great, the now capital of the realm that in 1721 would officially be named Russian Empire, he was ten years old.

²²⁷ RADOVSKY, 1959, pg. 6.

²²⁸ Ibid. pg. 7.

Antioch was first home schooled, under the tutelage of the Greek pope Anastasius Kondoidis,²²⁹ an acquaintance of Dmitri's from Constantinople who went to Moscow with him after the Pruth Campaign. A progressive clergyman, Kondoidis would be a relatively important name in the Holy Synod established by Peter after his extinction of the Patriarchate of Moscow, reaching the post of Bishop of Vologodsky (1726-1735), and Suzdal (1735-1737). Possibly a member of the same milieu that formed Dmitri Cantemir, Kondoidis was a man who, besides his native Greek language, knew Latin extensively and was well-known to the first members of the Academy of Sciences. He was eventually replaced by Liberius Koletius, former prisoner of the Solovetsky Monastery and, according to Dmitri Cantemir in his intersection in his favour before Peter "was especially versed in high languages".²³⁰ As teacher of Russian, or the fuzzy amalgam between Church Slavonic and the colloquial, simple, Muscovite dialect that then must have been that language, Antioch received the precious lessons of Ivan Il'insky, a pioneer in the first projects of translation requisitioned by Peter and professor at the Slav-Greek-Latin Academy. Il'insky was probably one of the most important influences in shaping Kantemir's (proto-)Russian and proclivity towards literature.

Kantemir also was a student in the Slav-Greek-Latin Academy, the already mentioned single higher institution in Muscovy before the establishment of the Academy of Sciences. He studied there a few years before its other great alumnus, the ultimate founder of Russian poetic forms, Mikhail Lomonosov. Although fundamentally ecclesiastical and serving the primary purpose of preparing the children of Russian clergy for ecclesiastical offices, the SGL Academy was the only place in Russia (excluding, the already mentioned Academy of Kiev) one could receive a formation in Latin, Rhetoric, Scholastic Philosophy and Theology. It is not clear how long Antioch spent there nor which courses he took, but, unlike Lomonosov, who

²²⁹ in Russian (

²³⁰ Ibid. pg. 10 [TRADUZIR DIREITO].

had to race through the whole curriculum at a later age,²³¹ the boy may have gone directly to the higher classes, considering his educational background, but there are no grounds to affirm he ever completed the stipulated course.²³²

Dmitri Cantemir promised to leave all his estate to the best accomplished son in intellectual pursuits. The boy, who was certainly the most intellectually gifted of his sons, was said to have been the favourite of his father and was due to receive all his property. However, when he died in 1723 this is not what happened to the thirteen-year-old boy. All Dmitri's estate went to his brother Konstantin, and, in the ensuing dispute with his siblings, Antiokh was left without any means. The first extant autograph by Kantemir, dated from May 1724, is a letter sent directly to the Emperor Peter I, asking his intervention to grant him the wish of his father to be sent abroad in order to complete his education, as was a common among the sons of the nobility in the Petrine era.²³³ Apparently the Emperor, who would die less than one year later, did not grant the request of his late friend's son, since no answer was ever to be found.

Antiokh Dmitrevich served for a brief time in the army, of which he kept a brief diary. Soon after, his name is found in the list of the first students to attend the Academy of Sciences, among those who attended the first lectures read in 1727 still during the reign of Peter's widow, Catherine I.²³⁴ He would study in the AS a little over two years, during which he had the first contact with a true western university education with almost exclusively German professors, stemming from Leipzig, Heidelberg, Berlin and other German centres that dominated the institution in the first half of 18th C.²³⁵ Kantemir studied physics (natural philosophy) under Georg Bilfinger, ex-professor at Tübingen, the main introducer of Newtonian physics into Russia and former student of the great Christian Wolff, the principal figure of German

²³¹ Frate, 2016.

²³² Radovsky, 1959, pg. 91, note 57.

²³³ On pg.13, Radovsky offers a facsimile of the letter.

²³⁴ Ibid. pg. 15 and pg. 92, note 75.

²³⁵ Ibid. pg. 19ff.

enlightenment between Leibniz and Kant. Bilfinger was a central influence in shaping the worldview Kantemir would manifest not only in his poetical works, but in other endeavours such as the preface to his Russian translation of the *Conversations on the Plurality of the Worlds* (*Entretiens sur la pluralité des mondes*), by the other eminent enlightenment writer, Bernard de Fontenelle.²³⁶

Other German teachers would contribute to his formation. Under Gottlieb-Siegfried Bayer (1694-1738) he received the fundamentals of his Latin and ancient literature in general. Classicist by formation and Orientalist in his principal field of working, Bayer was chair of Greek and Latin Antiquities from 1726 to 1737 and left a modest contribution to the AS. Antiokh possibly owes to him the best part of his formation in the Classics. They kept relevant correspondence and Bayer would compose a history of the clan Kantemir, starting with his grandfather Konstantin, but praising, above all, his great father.²³⁷ However, the most substantial correspondence between Kantemir and a German teacher we have is with his professor of Moral Philosophy, Christian-Friedrich Gross (16-174X). A student of Bilfinger, later promoted to professor of the AS who would eventually take his own life due to an outrage suffered in the aftermath of one of the upcoming coups that would shake the Empire in the next decades. The first editor of the *Sankt-Petersbuskie Vedomosti*, the periodical published by the Academy, which would be so important to Trediakovsky and Lomonosov, his classes on Ethics were possibly a third part of Kantemir's formation and it is not excluded the possibility that he was a major influence in the translation of Horace's Epistles investigated in this chapter.²³⁸

After two years in the Academy of Sciences, he would spend short of four years in Moscow, due to the momentarily transfer of the court to the old capital in the brief reign of

²³⁶ Published in [...]. This work received a relatively wide reception in Russia, being very important in the works of Lomonosov [...]

²³⁷ History

²³⁸ It would be valid to examine the correspondence between the two . Unfortunately, they have never been edited and remain in the archives of [...].

Peter II. Here he would compose the best part of his poetical works including some translations, would gain notoriety among other important intellectual and political figures in the Empire and would be part of the political turmoil that followed the untimely death of Emperor Peter II.²³⁹

During the two year-reign of Peter II, Kantemir gained full notoriety among the greatest thinkers and men of letters of the time. To name the most important, Feofan Prokopovich, noticed the young talent after receiving his First Satire anonymously sent by an admirer. This enthusiasm is expressed in the few verses Prokopovich wrote to praise the still unknown satirist, so in tune with the enterprise of enlightening that backwards Orthodox realm. In these words, we read an appropriation of Horace that would become the sobriquet of these pioneers of Russian enlightenment that *with a brave pen would destroy every bad habit*.²⁴⁰ the *uchennaia družina*, or the learned company.²⁴¹ This group, made up by the historian and also contributor to Peter the Great's enlightenment enterprises, Vasily Tatischev, was constituted by members of different backgrounds and ages, but who were closely united in the values advanced by Peter the Great. They would be the first to configure a modern intellectual milieu, as seeds to a broader literary and intellectual field.

Antioch was also part of the political scene that led to the succession crisis in Anna Ioanovna's ascension. In the ensuing debates and struggles that took place between the "oligarchs" from the Council and the supporters of Anna's absolute power, he remained on the winners' side. The Empress tore up the compromise and inaugurated the so-called German

²³⁹ After Peter II's death, the male lineage of the Romanovs ended and, the power being in the hands of the Supreme Privy Council, the throne was offered to Anna Ioanovna, niece of Peter the Great, daughter of his brother who co-ruled with him as Tsar Ivan V. In effect a German (she was wife to the Duke of Holstein Gottosinses and lived almost her entire youth and early adulthood there) she ascended the throne after signing, still in Germany, a charter of conditions that would markedly restrict her powers, concentrate executive action in the hands of the Council and the Senate, which might have been turned into an effective legislative house. As soon as she arrived, Anna tore up the charter, arrested, killed and exiled the most prominent members of the Supreme Privy Council and ruled as an autocrat. On the possibility of Russia turning into a constitutional monarchy in the 1730's, and its central players Cf. De Madariaga, 2014, pp. 57-77.

²⁴⁰ EREMIN, 1961, pp. 216-217.

²⁴¹ The term is an appropriation of Ep. 1.3 vv. XX. As we shall see, Kantemir alludes of this term in his translation.

yoke era, also named by Russian historians as *Bironovschina*, a decade dominated by the whimsical authoritarian wishes of Anna's favourite and lover, the notorious Ernst Johann von Biron. Kantemir's support was first manifested as an agitator of the Imperial Guard where, it is said, he played an important role in keeping the soldiery on the Empress side, and afterwards as an earnest subject of Peter I's Empire in an address to the newly established autocrat to terminate the Privy Council, by incorporating it into the State Senate, as intended by her uncle, Peter the Great.²⁴² The council was subsequently dissolved, its principal members arrested, exiled or murdered, and there was one more step towards the consolidation of autocracy in the Russian Empire.

In the political rearrangement that ensued, Kantemir was perhaps not the best person to have around so close to the court. Some intrigues around himself and Prince Andrey Ivanovich Osterman, the gigantic former associate of Peter the Great in the delicate negotiations that took place after Poltava, minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Empire ever since the emperor died and one of the principal supporters of Anna's claim, made the young man an inconvenience around the court. Be that as it may Osterman arranged for the young man to go to England as Ambassador of the Russian Empire. Kantemir would depart in January 1722 and arrive at his final destination by the end of March.

In England he would serve for six years. He was the first ambassador in the recently re-established diplomatic relations severed after an incident in 1719, in the aftermath of Charles XII's death and the reorganization of alliances that followed. The impressions left on most of his English counterparts was rather favourable, praised especially in his precocious erudition and in his gift for science and knowledge. His reputation as a writer and poet had preceded him and he arrived there as a highly respected figure. Several commercial agreements were signed

²⁴² Radovsky, 1959, pg. 36.

between the two countries during his time as ambassador to England, in an accomplished tenure. Above all, he is best remembered by his deeds and achievements in the cultural and intellectual fields, and the active role he took in the affairs of the AS, despite the distance, the other more pressing issues he faced as a diplomat, and his sickly constitution.

Possibly one of the most relevant correspondence we have in the years as ambassador to Britain were that between him and the president of the Academy of Sciences, baron Korf.²⁴³ Kantemir helped the academy by providing several accounts on instruments and recent inventions in the nautical and scientific area, most of which would help in consolidating Russia's expansion to the East, started a few years earlier with the expeditions that would result in the discovery of Alaska. Kantemir paid close attention to the exploration campaigns conducted to the depths of Siberia and North America, which can be assessed by his correspondence with Korf and other professors of the AS. During his period in Britain Kantemir would not keep a close contact with the professors from the AS, especially with his former professor of ethics and now close friend, Christian Friedrich Gross.

All throughout his time as a diplomat Kantemir managed to stay around the intellectual circles in each of the countries he served. In England he made several connections with a high number of "learned people" that populated his house in his time as ambassador.²⁴⁴ There, he was closely connected to several writers, artists, scientists, especially those stemming from Italy. Influenced above all by Italian language and culture, Kantemir would spend the best part of his time among these gentlemen from the Italian community in London, in what he called in a letter, his private *club*. Their absence would be much felt after Kantemir moved to Paris and it is very likely that these Italian gentlemen played a great role in his later compositions and

²⁴³ Baron Johann Albrecht Korf (1697-1766). Born in Courland, he soon attached himself to Anna Ioanovna's milieu and, after her ascension to the Russian throne, he moved to Russian where eventually he would occupy the presidency of the AS (1734-1740). Cf. Pekarsky, 1870, pp. 516-535.

²⁴⁴ Radovsky, 1959. Pg. 41.

reorganization of older poetic works, as might be the case of his fifth satire *Against bad habits in General. Satyr and Periergus*.²⁴⁵

In England his most active literary occupations consisted in translations from the ancients. One of those that could not reach us, but which it seems he devoted a great deal of time and attention, was his translation of Roman historian Justinus. Another translation dated from the period, more relevant in his literary achievements and to our purposes, is his translation of the Anacreontea, possibly the first ever to be carried out in Russian language, and a ground-breaking work that must be given its due attention elsewhere. As already mentioned,²⁴⁶ the Anacreontea were the first genre of low, light poetry to be practiced in 18th C. Russia, with absolutely every one of its principal writers practicing it, and some of them, as was the case of Lomonosov and Dezhavin,²⁴⁷ creating perennial works of art that enter most manuals of Russian literature. Once again, Kantemir in this particular topic must start every account of anacreontic poetry in Russian literature.²⁴⁸

After sixteen years in England the poet was appointed ambassador to the Kingdom of France. Kantemir moved to Paris in September 1738, where he would live the remaining six years of his life and would aptly conduct the business with Cardinal du Fleury, the chief minister of Louis XV. Here, no more than in England he would surround himself with men of letters, scientists and intellectuals, like the Italian coterie that would frequent his house in London. His feeble complexion was already starting to give way to the consumption that would

²⁴⁵ For an account of Kantemir's Italian acquaintances in London, especially his connection with Venetian polymath Francesco Algarotti, cf. Serman, 1999.

²⁴⁶ Cf. above,

²⁴⁷ Derzhavin is perhaps the most accomplished Russian anacreontic poet, crowned with the anthology *Anacreontic Songs (Anakreontichskye Pesnyi)*. Lomonosov's own appropriations led to the highly original *Razgovor s Anakreonom* (Conversation with Anacreon), where the enthusiastic, patriotic, Russian poet replies with his own compositions in agonistic fashion to translations from the old Greek master of love and wine and brevity. Cf. Note XX and pp. XX

²⁴⁸ There were a few by Prokopovich, though. and those experiments by the Lutheran missionaries that were the first syllabo-tonic poetic experiments in Russia, Guck, Pauss.... Drage, 1960; 1961. Smith, 1973; Bucsele, 1965. [ELABORAR]

plague his last years. Now he took a more retired lifestyle, but still kept in contact with the highest intellectual strata of Parisian society. It is worth mentioning that Voltaire was one of the gentlemen who was his acquaintance, with two extant letters from the French luminary. Part of a greater correspondence, in these two letters addressed to the prince, both dated from 1739, Voltaire gives heed to the prince's complains against a few remarks the philosophe made in his History of Charles XII regarding the provenance of his family. Kantemir would have complained against assigning the origins of his father from Greece instead of the descending directly from Tamerlane, as claimed by the family in its traditional genealogy. Voltaire promises the pertinent corrections in the next editions of his History, but it seems he failed to do so.²⁴⁹

It was in Paris where he wrote his remaining extant literary works. There he organized and compiled all his works, sending them in 1743 to Russia for publication. It would, however, take almost twenty years for it to be accomplished, only being integrally published in 1762. In Paris he received his principal biography, a *Vie* anonymous published as an appendix to the translation of his satires to French, attributed to the Italian abbé, the Comte Octavien de Guasco (1711-81).²⁵⁰ This is the first biographical remark we have on Kantemir, and the most important contemporary account of his life, serving as the basis to most of his subsequent biographies. Paris was also the place he composed the translations to be discussed in this chapter, two years prior to his death. On March 31st (April 11th, OS), 1744, due to an aggravation of respiratory problems, he would end his live at his home.

²⁴⁹ Efremov, 1868. pp. 435 – 440.

²⁵⁰ Published as *Satyres de M. le Prince Cantemir. Traduites en François. Avec l'histoire de sa vie.*, London, 1749. Guasco is a shady character, mostly known for his correspondence with Montesquieu, published anonymously in 1767, in view of a quarrel he had against Mme. Geofrin, a *grand dame* whose circle would be attended by himself and Montesquieu. cf. Evans, 1958.

2. A few words on Kantemir's stance on Russian poetic forms

Antioch Kantemir was the first in Russia to write entirely non-ecclesiastical poetry in a tradition taken over by 16th C. French and English literatures from the Ancient Greek and Roman legacy. His best-known accomplishment is the collection of nine satires that mock and laugh at the obscurantist and backward worldview represented by reactionary factions of Russian society from the new, enlightened, Petrine perspective. The principal target of this derisive but not too acrimonious satirist were, naturally, the most hard-core factions of the Russian Orthodox clergy, represented by supporters of the recently abolished Patriarchate of Moscow, and principal opponents of the Holy-Synod and Feofan Prokopovich. For the first time State-sponsored satirical poems against the clergy, informed by the Classical canon, were published in the recently created empire. It was a very eloquent voice for the new Russia that was being raised among important circles around the emperor and the subsequent empresses, that was to vie with that of the great Prokopovich, trumpeted ten years earlier.

The ridicule of these more reactionary sectors of the church and court was effective in its objectives. Combined with Prokopovich's poignant, acute, oratory, and with Vassily Tatischev, the Historian of Peter the Great, a man who contributed to telling the deeds of the emperor thereby reinforcing the foundational myth of a New Russia, Kantemir's was a young witty fellow whose derision was crucial in downplaying the Yavorskys, Filarets and Polikarpovs that struggled to maintain their dignities from a time that was increasingly being perceived as the past. This close connection of the other members of the *Uchennaia Druzhina* granted a praiseworthy reception of his satires in the years he lived in Moscow, the then capital of the Empire. Kantemir enjoyed an instant fame in these years.

However, the form used by Kantemir held him back with the poets of old Muscovy from the 17th C. The brief tradition of syllabic verses started in Russian lands with the work of

Simeon Polotsky, the central figure the Slavonic poetry practiced in 17th C. Russia.²⁵¹ Polotsky was the man responsible for introducing into Russia the poetic form taken from the first prestigious Slavic vernacular language, Polish, established a little more than one century earlier by poets such as the already mentioned Jan Kochanowski.²⁵² This metre was a syllabic verse, based on principles of construction not much unlike those used in most modern Romance languages, that usually prescribe a verse with a fixed number of syllables, maintaining as obligatory the accentuation only in specific syllables of the verse.

Three were the most important forms of the Polish metrics: the thirteen-syllable line, composed of two hemistiches containing 7 and 6 syllables respectively, and the hendecasyllable, composed of two hemistiches of 5 and 6 syllables, and the octosyllable, consisting in two 4-syllable halves.²⁵³ These were the three measures practiced by Simeon Polotsky in most of his better known works such as the Rhymed Psalter (*Psaltyr Rifmovanny*), an imitation of Kochanowski's *Psalterz Dawidowy*, and the Garden of Abundant Flowers (*Vertograd Mnogotsvetny*) a miscellany compiled by Polotsky comprising most the best part of his career in a varied form.

This was the tradition available for our pioneers in the first decades of the 18thC. Both Trediakovsky and Kantemir made their propositions with this tradition in mind, trying not to depart too much from it. Trediakovsky wrote as if the theoretical approach to this tradition was wrong and reorganized this approach to discipline this traditional syllabic from a new perspective. Kantemir on the other hand wrote as if there was no reform to be made. He always approached poetry from a practical, intuitive, principle, formed by the old canons of church

²⁵¹ Simeon Polotsky (1629-1680). Ruthenian man of letters from the city of Polotsk (in today Belarus), trained in the AKM and later in the Jesuit College at Wilno. Gained notoriety after a few panegyrics written to Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich, which gained him a ticket to Moscow where he would eventually become the preceptor to Alexis' children, including the future tsar Fedor III, the Tsarevna Sophia and Peter I.

²⁵² Gasparov, 1996, pp. 247ff. Also cf. above, Chapter 1, pp. XX.

²⁵³ Ibid. pp. 227-8.

Slavonic poetry and the Italian poetical tradition,²⁵⁴ not devoting much attention to the question of the suitability of the traditional poetical forms to this new Russian language. Unlike Trediakovsky and Lomonosov, he did not feel the inappropriateness of the old, borrowed forms used to paraphrase the Psalms and compose devotional poetry by eminent members of the Russian Orthodox Church, and simply used this form to house a completely different orientation, elocution and matter. About ten years after writing his first satires, in 1743 Kantemir would expound his main theoretical principles in the *Letter to a friend by Khariton Makentin* (an anagram with the author's name). The letter would only be published in 1744 after Kantemir's death and was a response from this "simple dilettante" to the new "scholars" that were more inclined to establishing this new Russian poetry by prescribing its proper form.²⁵⁵

The letter was written in response especially to Trediakovsky's letter, and Lomonosov's propositions. Divided in 5 chapters, the letter tries to theoretically justify the positions adopted by Kantemir all throughout his career as a poet and translator. Chapter 1 makes a distinction between three possible types of verse taking up the theoretical tradition as started by the first Slavonic grammarian, Meletii Smotritsky.²⁵⁶ Smotritsky had a section in his grammar devoted to versification and there he proposed that the minimal constituents of the verse were long and short syllables just like in Latin and Greek languages. Trediakovsky in his 1735 method would scorn this proposal affirming that it would "contradict the particularities of the language."²⁵⁷ Kantemir admits the possibilities affirming that the differences between Russian and Greek languages are not that great as to scorn Smotritsky's quantitative prosody. Therefore, this is for

²⁵⁴

²⁵⁵

²⁵⁶ Meletii Smotritski (1570's – 1633). Ruthenian man of letters, theologian, one of the central figures in the controversy leading to the Union of Brest (1595-6), where several Ruthenian eparchies broke relations with the Eastern Orthodox church and entered in communion with Rome. Smotritsky played on both sides of the controversy, but in the meantime was responsible for the first authoritative grammar to be produced for the Slavonic language, the Correct Constitution of a Slavonic Grammar, 1619 (Грамматики Славѣнскиѧ прѣвильное сѣнта҃ма – *Grammatiki slavenskiia pravilnoe syntagma*).

²⁵⁷ Trediakovsky, 1963, pg. 366.

Kantemir the first kind of verse presented: verses composed in the manner of Latin and Greek without rhymes. The other two are what Kantemir calls free verse: verses that maintain a given number of syllables but do not present rhymes. Kantemir calls them free (*svobodnye*) after the Italian denomination (*versi sciolti*). The third kind Kantemir calls same-ending verses, that is, verses with the same number of syllables presenting a final rhyme.

After this introduction to the different possible kinds of verses, Kantemir dedicates the other two chapters of his letter to the treatment of rhymes, defining the concept, separating their different kinds (one, two or three-syllable rhymes, that is, masculine, feminine and dactylic) and the rules governing their uses. Chapter 3 continues with the treatment of rhymes, now focusing on the possibilities of freedom to rhymes. The poet will consider the most similar consonants that can be used without estrangement, in a kind of theory of near rhymes.

The next two chapters are a regulation on the syllabic verse that Kantemir employed all throughout his career. The 13-syllable line, named by him (and Trediakovsky), the heroic verse, due to its closeness to the ancient hexameter, is duly regulated, stating that it should be divided in two hemistiches, and that the first half of the verse can have a caesura marked as masculine or dactylic. The ending of the second half of the verse must be feminine, followed the Slavonic and Polish syllabic tradition. All other syllables are free in regard to their tonicity. It is not much different from Trediakovsky's propositions for the 1735, whose differences consist in a stiffer trochaic rhythm and a masculine caesura in correspondence to the feminine ending.²⁵⁸

To cut things short, this is a brief overview of Kantemir's positions regarding the form he practiced in his poetry and translations. The Epistles will be rendered in this 13-line verse, in what Kantemir calls *free verse*. It is in the consideration of the different kinds of rhymes as well as the stated possibility of their being altogether dropped that lies the interest of

²⁵⁸ Cf. Gasparov, 2000, pg.

Kantemir's theoretical views, that will be applied in practice in the first ever translation to Russian of a complete work by an author of Ancient antiquity.²⁵⁹

3. The translation

a. circumstantial info

The first integral commented translation of an Ancient Roman poet were the *Epistles of Quintus Horatius Flaccus translated in Russian verses and clarified with notes. Paris 1742*. They were possibly the latest of Kantemir's works, having been composed in 1742, two years before his death, and were the first integral translation of a complete book composed by an ancient author in Russian.²⁶⁰ The immediate significance of such translation, however, was almost entirely cut short by its untimely arrival in Russia, an almost negligible editorial output, and the lack of favour Kantemir fell after the impact of Lomonosov and Sumarokov in Russian letters.

It was published anonymously in 1744 by the Academy of Sciences as a brochure that counted 300 copies.²⁶¹ This 108-page issue bears the title *Ten letters of Quintus Horatius Flaccus' first book. Translated from Latin verses into Russian, clarified by a famous enthusiast of poetry [versemaking], with an included letter on Russian versification*.²⁶² It was an extensively abridged version of the translation and edited with the aforementioned Khariton Makentín's Letter to a Friend, containing the first ten epistles, translated with their respective notes. It was most likely published in June a few months after Kantemir's death, in 31 March 1744 (11 April O.S.) and had as proof-reader none other than Vasily Kirilovich

²⁵⁹ Alekseeva, 2013, pg. 7.

²⁶⁰ There were earlier enterprises in Peter the great's time. Apollodorus (it was not integral).

²⁶¹ Alekseeva, 2013, pg. 7

²⁶² Квинта Горация Флакка десять писем первой книги: переведены с латинских стихов на русские и примечаниями изъяснены от знатного некоторого охотника до стихотворства с приобщенным при том письмом о сложении русских стихов. СПб., 1744.

Trediakovsky.²⁶³ The manuscript version had been finished in Paris, 1742, but it is likely that it only arrived in Russia in 1743, for Trediakovsky's first mentioning of it in a letter dated from May 1743.²⁶⁴ It is likely that Trediakovsky had a role in the publication of the translations, in the same edition as the Kantemir's letter on versification.

In 1788, it gained another edition, with the slightly longer length of 123 pages, demonstrating that it was not altogether forgotten, but it was rather a reprint of the same text edition, without including any of the remaining still unpublished translations. Thus, it remained, almost unknown and irrelevant in Russian literary circles until the first authoritative edition of Kantemir's works, by P.A. Efremov (1830-1907), as part of the collection edited by I.I. Glazunov (1786-1849) *Russian Writers*. An expert philologist, owner of a unique collection of rare Russian editions and responsible for editing many 18thC. and his contemporary writers, Efremov edited the Complete Works in two volumes of Kantemir in 1867, bringing to light for the first time, along with his eight satires and other less famous poems, his lost translations of the Anacreontea and the Epistles of Horace. Efremov's edition minutely includes all notes appended by Kantemir along with the preface and dedication piece to Elizabeth. This remains the most philologically sound edition of Kantemir works and was the one used in this thesis.

Despite the lack of reach and significance within its contemporary literary field, the pioneer status of the translation, the objectives stated by its translator and the linguistic and formal choices coherent with the poet's practice, these translations are a landmark in the reception of Horace in Russia as a whole: it represented the first attempt to translate a whole book from classical antiquity, with all its intricacies and correspondences, and to establish a classical author as a pedagogical foundation not only as a model to the practice of poetry, but as an ethical guide to good and proper living in a new socio-cultural context in need for a new

²⁶³ Pekarsky, 18** pg.

²⁶⁴ Alekseeva, 2013, pg.

morality. The Horatian paradigm seemed to Kantemir the best model to this new man that was to be created in opposition of to an obscurantist, arcane, overly zealous pre-Petrine Orthodox. Furthermore, this translation corroborates the central argument of this thesis, the use of Horace, and especially the hexametric and didactic poet as a pedagogical foundation on which his future appropriations would take place. Sadly, it did not get to cause much impact in Russian letters. Despite the inherent qualities that call for a detailed analysis that proved impossible for this in this particular thesis, it was another ill-fated attempt of achieving the ultimately vain glory of pioneering in the formation of a new literature. Very few have read them, but these few never ceased to express their admiration. With these translations, Kantemir was indeed a pioneer.

b. the dedication to Empress Elizabeth

Like many other books published during the 18th C., Kantemir's translation opens with a dedication to the monarch, Empress Elizabeth and a brief preface which states the goals intended by the translation. After the dedication and the two-page preface there is a brief Life of Horace, likely the first ever produced in Russian.²⁶⁵ This dedication, along with the preface with translations to Portuguese and English are included in Appendix A of this thesis. It is a 24-line poem written in the same syllabic verse as the bulk of his production, contains all the conventions that governed the *encomium*, poetry of praise addressed to patrons or important political figures. It is divided in three sections containing the dedication proper, concerned with the invocation and praise of the Empress (1-10), followed by the stated goals of the original text (11-15), ending in the affectedly humble and unfavourable comparison between the original text with its prestigious Latin tongue, and the translation in this new "cheerful" Russian language.

²⁶⁵ Efremov, 1867, pp. 384-388.

The first section is dedicated entirely to the empress who eventually became the greatest recipient of the odes composed in the first generation, Elizabeth Petrovna, the Generous, as Lomonosov would repeatedly call her in his 1747 Ode on Elizabeth's Ascension to the Throne and several others.²⁶⁶ In 1744, when Kantemir composed the dedication, Elizabeth was entering her fourth year and many important events and accomplishments of her two-decade reign were still to come. However, in the hyperbolic odic representation,²⁶⁷ she was compared to Octavian Caesar Augustus, the first Emperor, celebrated by Horace, the "greatest poet of antiquity", as Kantemir himself will claim in the preface. Not only, however, is Elizabeth equalled to Augustus in "expanding and pacifying the realm, always victorious," and "building and "peacefully reigning all over the world among great deeds", but there is one characteristic in which she excels: in magnanimity, for she pardons and is kind to her enemies.

The liberal character of Elizabeth's reign and her allowance to figures in the educational scenario such as Ivan Shuvalov, and Mikhail Lomonosov, was the main topic explored by her poets in their odes, inscriptions and other laudatory utterances. But the hyperbolic approximation of the empress directly with Augustus is rare [perhaps non-existent] in the period and was carried out by Kantemir [possibly due to matters of concision]. Nevertheless, it veils a witty procedure. The approximation is twofold: In the third section (vv. 16-24), as the empress is compared favourably to Augustus, so the poet compares himself to Horace from an unfavourable perspective. Naturally, the decorum required that the topos of humbleness must be observed, and so the poet presents his translation as an inferior piece of work, but not that much. In the comparison, the empress is only slightly favoured in relation to the emperor, exceeding him in only one characteristic. In the same proportion, the translator-poet could not compose a piece of work that equalled the old Roman in "sweetness", or grace, but could

²⁶⁶ *Shchodraya*. In the ode mentioned Lomonosov would reiterate the epithet several times, insisting on the quality best associated with the monarch. Lomonosov, PSS 8, pp. 196ff.

²⁶⁷ For the concepts of odic representation in its peculiarities cf. von Geldern, 1991.

produce something that nonetheless excels in *usefulness*, underscoring the edifying character of the didactic pieces (v. 19). The unfavourable comparison is attenuated by the help of the *laudanda*: *Not far back will I stay, although I cannot be compared with him, / if I achieve your precious praise / my fame will reach my latest heirs / and I shall envy the Venutian no longer* (vv. 20-24). This humbly emulates Horace, most eloquently, in the final verses of Odes 1.1: “but if *you* rank me among the lyric bards of Greece, I shall soar aloft and strike the stars with my head”, varying it by employing the topos of immortal fame.²⁶⁸

To say few words more on the twofold comparison, it is disposed in a kind of chiasmic structure where Elizabeth (A) is placed slightly above Augustus (a), whereas Kantemir (b) is slightly below Horace (B). Wit is generated in a structure that frames in a very concise way the central section, properly concerned with the matter of the translated book (11-13): “The author intended to write to correct the mores, / craftily praise everywhere beautiful good deeds / and everywhere repulsive wrongdoing reproach”. It is a book to teach by praise and reproach, according to the everlasting ethics of a good citizen. This is the point in the dedication where the didactic aspect of the Horatian oeuvre is better underscored, and here, in the last two verses of the section, the empress, as becoming, has the final words of praise: “you are the greatest bulwark to good deeds / and no less apt to scare away the vices”.

The enunciation of the matter (11-15) is then framed in the slightly favourable comparison between Elizabeth and Augustus (1-10) and the slightly unfavourable comparison of the poet-translator with Horace (16-24). This sort of chiasmic procedure, not syntactical, rather semantical, of the frame encompasses the matter in the scheme: Aa C bB. Passage of five verses, C enunciates twice, in vv. 13 and 15 what is the ultimate goal and expectation of the enterprise and its dedicatee: the poet’s praise, and that she keep the good deeds of people

²⁶⁸ RACE, 2004, pg 24.

(*dobrodetel'*). The two verses containing the word alternate the intention towards its opposite: reproach and ward off bad mores and vices (vv 14-16).²⁶⁹ Reproach (*khulit'*) occupies the last position of verse 13, as if encapsulated by the reiterated *dobrodetel'*²⁷⁰ in vv. 13 and 15, in order to effectively subdue the bad mores (*zlonravie*), as if locked inside the verse by the action 'reproach'.

In the same wise, *Dobrodetel'* is syntactically enclosed within the verse by the attributive noun *zashchita*, protection, defence, aegis. This same procedure shifts again the focus onto the empress and closes the section. ethical jargon.²⁷¹ It belongs to the ecclesiastical tradition of Slavonic language, but here it seems to be used in a novel way.²⁷² The acute observation in the collocation of words presented in these four verses follow the lesson on disposition presented in AP vv. 47-48, where through a "skilful setting (*callida iunctura*) one makes a familiar word new."²⁷³

In the final portion (16-23) also are compared the correspondent languages involved in the work presented. Latin is first mentioned in the first section ("I bring you verses which in the Roman / tongue seemed fitting to please the ears / of Augustus", vv. 4-6), and the comparison with Russian happens in vv. 16-19. Here, the affected modesty concedes that the "Venutian sounds"²⁷⁴ are stronger, more pleasing. The poet-translator, however, writes in the language of the empress, a language defined as "cheerful", and the cheerfulness he claims for his language is then superimposed on the usefulness the translations will provide, being justified by it. In the combination of pleasure and learning, Kantemir merges two aspects the old master prescribes in a passage of his *Ars Poetica*: "Poets aim either to benefit, or to amuse,

²⁶⁹ *khulit' zlonravie* (v.14) and *poroki progoniat'* (v.16).

²⁷⁰ Repetition in polyptoton using the nominative and genitive forms of the word.

²⁷¹ DICTIONARIES: BIBLE GOOD SAMARITAN

²⁷² NO HOLD WATAH

²⁷³ FAIRCLOUGH, 2005: (...) notum si callida verbum / reddiderit iunctura novum.

²⁷⁴ Zvony. This is a

or to utter words at once both pleasing and helpful to life”.²⁷⁵ These are two aspects of the tripartition expounded elsewhere by Cicero on the objectives of the orator: *docere*, *movere* and *delectare*, and afterwards appropriated by the learned men of the Church as the main edifying qualities in the study of ancient Latin author.²⁷⁶

Kantemir speaks in the cheerful language that promotes rational enlightenment and scientific openness better employed in the simple, colloquial language that is but the variation enforced by Peter the Great in opposition to the old language of the now relegated, to a considerable degree, to the clergy. This facetious posture, peculiar to Horatian elocution, is the best way to dissolve a worldview that prevents the impending western scientific progress and cosmopolitanism imposed by Peter to his associates and successors in the geopolitical scenario of early 18th C. Europe. This cheerfulness Kantemir claims to perform, and from ‘cheerfulness’ we may apprehend simplicity, colloquiality,²⁷⁷ will be further investigated in the next section.

c. The preface and the *Vita Horatiana*

Immediately after the dedication comes two more straightforward documents, a preface informing on the nature and the objectives of the translation, and a Life of Horace that, as far as I could assess, belongs to Kantemir himself.

The first document is a very brief preface where the translator basically explains his choices in selecting the text and author to translate, his strategies in conveying the original text with the correspondent justifications for polemical formal choices, and the main objectives of his translation. In only two pages Kantemir exposes the main characteristics of his craft, also

²⁷⁵ FAIRCLOUGH 2005, pg. 478: *Aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae / aut simul et iocunda et idonea dicere vitae* AP 333-335).

²⁷⁶ Or.

²⁷⁷ DEFINITIONS (1st Chapt!)

displayed in other translations he performed, especially when rendering the Anacreontics, concluded during his mission to London in 1736. As mentioned,²⁷⁸ this is the first time a significant part of the Anacreontic poems was translated into Russian, and also the first time a poetical collection was presented as a unity with informative historical notes and explanations.

This translation remained virtually unknown until the 1867 edition by Efremov. In comparison to the latter translation of the Epistles, this was much more concise in its prefatory pieces, and contains a dedication to Empress Elizabeth, a preface, and a poet's life. The dedication is much more modest in literary ambition, being in prose and little more than an enumeration of her common epithets, similar to the best titles Lomonosov used in his odes. The preface tries to address in a much more concise way the same issues as in the preface to the Epistles and the life was most likely an original composition by Kantemir himself.

The preface to the Epistles begins with Kantemir bluntly justifying his choice of author and work to translate, right on the first sentence: "Of all ancient authors, I put Horace in the very first place,"²⁷⁹ a statement upheld by the enumeration of several of his qualities: Horace is fortunate in the composition of sentences, ingenious in the choices of adjectives, daring in his thoughts, and represents them with vigour and delight. These features are some of the expected qualities one finds in other accounts contemporary to Kantemir, and by ancient grammarians and rhetoricians, describing great writers of the past and present: Fortunateness, ingenuity, and boldness are complemented by perhaps the two most appreciated qualities in literary compositions: vigour²⁸⁰ and delight. These are very similar to the qualities Quintilian uses to describe the poetry of Horace. As the only Roman lyric worth to be read in his program of authors that would make the perfect orator: "for he rises at times to a lofty grandeur and is

²⁷⁸

²⁷⁹ EFREMOV, 1867, pg. 385. Cf. Appendix B.

²⁸⁰ Or strength: *sila*.

full of sprightliness and charm, while there is great variety in his figures, and his boldness in the choice of words is only equalled by his felicity.”²⁸¹

The second reason for Kantemir’s choice is perhaps the most important. Among all works by Horace, the Epistles were chosen due to their didactic character fitting for the teaching of ethics, here calqued as *nravoucheniia*. Teaching how to live and how to behave in this new post-Petrine world was perhaps the most important educational aspect in the formation of a citizen, apart from the modern technical abilities needed for pragmatic purposes. The Epistles, traditionally seen as the most mature of Horatian compositions, were chosen here for a particularity that sets the poet apart: “almost every single line of his contain a useful rule or precept useful for the formation of a life.”²⁸² One of the principal characteristics of the Horatian poetry is its ability for the synthesis displayed in the *sententiae*, maxims, or gnomic expressions. As mentioned below in the analysis of the translations of the AP, the maxims are the most remarkable devices in the composition, and one of the most important features for a translator to render in their language, especially if they wish their translations had a lasting impact on the public, consolidating its fame. The conciseness, pungency and vigour of expression in countless passages, have made Horace one of the best-known poets of antiquity and one of the most widely quoted. In the Epistles, the Venutian is especially rich in such maxims, serving as ancillary expressions to admonitions and pieces of advice, or consisting themselves in the admonitions used to convey the given philosophical advice.

The next topic Kantemir mentions regards a formal peculiarity he chose and felt obliged to justify: the absence of rhymes in the translation. In a justification that brings to mind a similar, albeit less affected, diffidence as that of Trediakovsky in his preface to *SiP* one decade later, in regard to his translation of the AP being translated in prose. As seen in the last chapter,

²⁸¹ IO 10.96. Translation by Harold Edgeworth Butler.

²⁸² EFREMOV, 1867.

in the case of Trediakovsky and his French background, translating Greek and Roman literary texts in a literary fashion usually entailed the use of rhymes, even though no such concept existed in Ancient Greek or Latin.²⁸³ Now the work of a poet nurtured in different branches of the tradition, the translator of the Epistles is cautious in asserting that he chose [rhymeless] verse to be more faithful, and that the inclusion of rhymes would represent too great a departure from the original text.

Kantemir did not feel such necessity in justifying his translations of the Anacreontics, only mentioning that he did not use them to make the meaning clearer, but here he dialectically raises probable objections to this formal peculiarity. To the probable objections one might have made against the lack of such a supposedly important device, he lists, as usual, the authorities that preceded him. He mentions basically three out of “countless” authors.²⁸⁴ The two first are Italian: the celebrated 16th C. translation of the Aeneid of 15** by Annibale Caro (1507-1566), and the contemporary 18th C. translation of Lucretius’ *De Rerum Natura* mentioned along with *Italia liberata dai Goti*, Italy liberated from the Goths, both works by Gian Giorgio Trissino (1478-1550). The third one is English: Milton’s *Paradise Lost*.

Rhymes were one of the principal elements of vernacular poetry, and its use in the translation of the ancient classical corpus was the most common practice. In both Kantemir’s “cultural grounds”, Italy and England, blank verse was not the most extensively employed formal parameter to render hexametric poetry, but hardly was a novelty or rarity. The absence of rhymes was not a matter of polemics, being attempted and consolidated practice since the first decades of 16th C.²⁸⁵ The Italian translations and originals mentioned by Kantemir were

²⁸³ The closest feature is the homeoteleuton, equal ending, which may appear in positions of rhyme (cf. AP. vv.99-100), but it was a rhetorical device among others and never counted as an intrinsic formal poetic element, the absence of which could be considered a fault.

²⁸⁴

²⁸⁵

the first to bring the form to a full rhetorical and elocutionary development in the heroic, lofty, matter.

In Italy the tradition of employing *versi sciolti*, that is, unrhymed hendecasyllables, was perhaps best represented by the coiner of the term, Trissino, in his preface to *Italia liberata* but it was not the first specimen of blank verse employed to an epic composition correspondent to the hexameter.²⁸⁶ A few years before books 2 (1539) and 4 (1534) of the *Aeneid* also received translations also in *versi sciolti* by Ippolito de Medici (1511 – 1535) and (Niccolò Liburnio, 1470 – 1557).²⁸⁷ To all intents and purposes, however, Trissino entered history as the greatest exponent of the practice with his influential epic poem. He became the best authority for subsequent authors in the practice, including in England. It is no wonder why Kantemir chose him as one of the authorities to uphold his formal choices.

In England a similar thing took place, with obscure translations preceding more famous ones. Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey (1516-17 – 1547) employed the scheme for the first time in the 1540's, with his translation of the second and fourth books of Vergil's *Aeneid*. A better-known contemporary in the blank verse was Christopher Marlowe (1564 – 1593), with his translation of the 1st book of Lucan's *Pharsalia*, issued posthumously in 1600.²⁸⁸ These two specimens, however, remained relatively unknown, consisting in the only examples of blank verse employed in appropriations of ancient epic hexametric poetry before the publication of Milton's *Paradise Lost* in 1667. All other translations and original compositions of ancient epic poetry, and here we can include the best-known monuments of Chapman in his rendering of Homer, and, for instance, Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, employed rhymes in their formal parameters and this resonated as the expected practice. Blank verse had developed in parallel

²⁸⁶ Trissino:

²⁸⁷

²⁸⁸ Hardison Jr., 1984. pp. 253-274.

in English poetry as a chiefly dramatic verse,²⁸⁹ and in the 1660's was an odd choice for hexametric epic poetry. Milton was obliged to explain his choice for his *magnum opus*. *Paradise lost* is written in "English heroic verse without rime, as that of Homer in Greek and Virgil in Latin."²⁹⁰

Milton is blunt when justifying his choices in the Preface: rhymes are "no necessary adjunct or true ornament of poem or good verse." Rather, they are "a hindrance, a constraint to express many things that otherwise (...) than else they would have expressed them." His poem was to be disposed in nothing else than "apt numbers, fit quantity of syllables, and the sense variously drawn out from one verse into another", that is, the unrestricted adoption of enjambement. Matter and meaning were the central preoccupations of the poet that was to "soar / above the Aonian mount, while it pursues / things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme." (1, vv.13-15). Rather than being detrimental to the poem, the absence of those "jingling sounds of like endings" would serve to elevate it to the same status as the works by Homer and Virgil. Milton haughtily asserts the superiority of blank verse in supplying the necessities of epic poetry, especially when it comes to its narrative nature. The same iambic pentameter of the foundational, unparalleled, tradition of Elizabethan theatre was duly legitimised for another poetic genre.

So we see three different postures in the defence of unrhymed verse in these three authorities brought Kantemir in his preface. Naturally, Kantemir was much humbler in his also humbler literary enterprise. Like all the authorities he mentions in his preface, he justifies his formal choice but in a more contained manner.

²⁸⁹ The first work to employ blank verse in English drama was *Gorboduc* by Thomas Norton (1532-1584) and Thomas Sackville (1536-1608), acted before Queen Elizabeth I in the Christmas of 1561.

²⁹⁰ MILTON, 2004.

In the last explanation of his translation procedures Kantemir states the attempt to keep his version of the Epistles “word by word”, and besides, to introduce new words, coined by the author from the Latin original, in a foreignizing stance that promotes to an even greater degree the didactic and formative perspective emphasized by the author, and the other poets translators of this first generation. Kantemir asserts his wish that these new words will be adopted in the general Russian vocabulary, and his hope that they will “not contradict the ways of the Russian language and will be accepted by the people, thereby enriching the language”. To grant that these words will be “completely understood”, Kantemir furnishes these new words with explanatory notes “to maintain their full vigour”.

The other notes are related to historical and political data related to the Roman world of the late Republic/Augustan period. Being the most referential of Horace’s works along with the Satires, Kantemir addresses the problem that without them they may be almost incomprehensible. According to Kantemir, these notes were taken from the complete works of Horace by Andre Dacier, but most of them were produced by the translator’s own pen.

It is beyond my reach to definitely determine which specific edition by Dacier’s Complete Works was used, but the most likely is the joint venture between himself and Sanadon published first in 1735, the same used by Trediakovsky in his translation of the AP.²⁹¹ This joint edition with the translations of both Frenchmen side-by-side, furnished with commentaries to all passages of the text proved to be the most influential edition of Horace in Russia and was used by Kantemir in his notes, as he himself asserts in the preface. Unlike Trediakovsky he duly mentions which notes were taken from Dacier and which he himself wrote.

²⁹¹ Alekseeva, 2013, presents a brief discussion conjecturing on the exact edition used by Kantemir.

Having presented his translation of the in the preface, Kantemir also includes in the volume a *zhitie Kvinta Goratsiia Flaka*, a Life of Horace, as expected from most of the pre-modern editions of ancient authors, that almost always included a *Vita Horatiana* in their editions. The earlier printed editions of Horace usually included the famous Life and the principal source of information on the life of Horace, besides his own accounts, attributed to Suetonius. This Life was included in the greater collection known *Vitae Poetarum*, of which few of these lives survive. Unlike other Italian, French, English editions that usually include the authoritative and *Vita* attributed to Suetonius, here Kantemir produced a text with his own words.

In a two-page biographical remark, Kantemir reorganizes the information contained in Suetonius' Life, adding a few pieces of information that might have proved relevant to better situate a reader unacquainted with classical antiquity and subtracting other that might not have sounded too wholesome to these readers. Instead of Suetonius, who situates the information on date of birth and death in the end of the text, Kantemir states the information regarding Horace's birth right at the beginning, as a way to maintain chronological order. Here Kantemir chooses not to omit the traditional Roman way of marking the years, by mentioning the consuls seated at the moment. He does not fail to mention that Horace was born in the year of Consuls L. Aurelius Cotta and Manlius Torquatus, but unlike Suetonius, he does not mention the exact date of birth in the Roman calendar (*He was born on the sixth day before the Ides of December in the consulate of Lucius Cotta and Lucius Torquatus*).²⁹² He adds, however, the information on the Catiline's conspiracy, possibly in a way to better situate his intended reader with a better known historical fact. Another example of addition made by the translator, intended to a

²⁹² ROLFE, 1959, pg. 480.

Russian contemporary reader is the correspondence between military tribune and *polkovnik* (colonel), a very recognizable rank in the new organization of Peter's army.

About the subtractions, the most eloquent is that Kantemir altogether omits the poet's lust depicted by Suetonius with the flamboyant disclosure of the poet's sexual practices, like the ceiling mirror he installed to watch his own performances in bed. Rather, Kantemir replaces it with a simple "*He was inclined to the feminine sex*". The translator choses other pieces of information absent from Suetonius' Life but taken from his own readings of the poet's works. One of them is when he mentions that Horace "loved moderate meals, but with clean table settings, apparel and house". This may be a reference to Epistles 5, addressed to Torquatus, where the poet says: "If you can recline at my table on couches made by Archias, and are not afraid of 'a dinner of herbs, only from a modest dish, I shall expect you, Torquatus, at my house at sunset. (...) Long has my hearth been bright, and the furniture made neat for you'".²⁹³

Kantemir leaves to the end the facts on Horace's death and the resumé of his poetical career. He does not mention the consuls in office in the year of his death, as he does when stated his date of birth. This is another difference from Suetonius who says Horace died in the consulships of G. Marius Censorinus and G. Asinius Gallus. The ailments that plagued the poet in his final years also differ from the two lives: Kantemir says that Horace suffered from his eyes and this is not mentioned in Suetonius. That Horace was interred beside Maecenas grave is an fact shared by both lives.

The poet's resumé is the final addition made by Kantemir, stating all the extant works produced by the Venutian. Just like his French source, Dacier, Kantemir considers the Epodes to be a fifth book of Odes and not a work considered apart. In the closing remarks, Kantemir provides a few last eulogies to the poet according to the appreciation of "ancient and modern

²⁹³ Epist. 1.5, vv. 1-3 (...) 6.

writers”, reinforcing the qualities already mentioned in the preface: “an exceptional sharpness of with, a great force and delight in expression and a particular art in making the things agree with their respective words.”

This is a very brief and incomplete account of Kantemir’s assessment of Horace’s Epistles. Unfortunately, it proved impossible to pay a more deserved attention to it, and a detained analysis of some of his translations is still a called-for enterprise. This must be left for another occasion for despite Kantemir’s translations of Horace having remained almost completely forgotten and had almost no impact in his times, it nevertheless consists in a very important piece of philological inquiry in Russia, showing the possibilities of the reception of Horace and the classics in general in such a momentous period. It provides a window to assessing the poetical practices of a very particular man of letters of Russia, who bet in a formal tradition that has not thrived in his country but, due to this very fact had in Antiokh Dmitrevich Kantemir its most perfect development.

V. Conclusion

Having focused on part of his hexametric production, in special the AP, this thesis tried to present the reception of Horace with translations carried out by central literary figures in the first generation of Russian literature. As already extensively mentioned throughout this thesis, this was a period in the formation of Russian language when new but essentially traditional literary conceptions were taking place, new poetic forms were being introduced, new literary authorities were being regarded as models of appropriation. The very nature of a poetic production inherently based on the imitation of foreign authorities inherited from the Western, Greco-Roman tradition, incited in some of these authors a quest for being the first to appropriate these models in their land. This quest, in itself also an inherited poetic topos, generated in some of them an anxiety for boasting the title of being the first ever to introduce a given authoritative classical model speaking the new Russian language, or to be the innovator who introduced a given poetic form or literary trend that would set the standards to the future poets to come.

In doing so, some of these first poets saw themselves in a peculiar position, as the imitation of new foreign models were granted the authority of erudition, balance, sophistication, in opposition to the previous cultural status, deemed by the current cultural and political authorities the opposite of these characteristics. New models were introduced, but imitation remained the governing principle in poetic practice, with translation being the first step in the appropriation of a given model. The model is the standard with which to compare one's own textual production, and this specially serves in a historical context when the quest

for models of display is also political, usually affirmed by force of coercion.²⁹⁴ But imitation, I would argue, is only one step in a general spectrum of appropriation of a given authoritative text. At the same time, how imitates must always avoid being *superstitious*. It is always a delicate subject to maintain a degree of individuality in front of model of authority and imitating a particular strong point of the model was always a difficult thing in granting the variety that will make the end text interesting. The fact is that if Prokopovich's admonitions are taken in the compositions of new texts, some degree of infidelity to the model is essential, as long as the imitator artfully produces a text that presents a relevant actualization of the canon, while having the shadow of its model behind it.

On the other hand, translation is the approach to the original work that is mostly concerned with conveying the original meaning, or another essential particularity of a given source text written in a foreign language. Irrespective of the many theories that try to understand it and the prescriptions that try to regulate and streamline its practices, it has as central feature a given degree of fidelity to its source and by nature it has to be as close to the source text as possible, whether a particular [point of contact] is emphasized by the translator or having as broad in its criteria as possible. Or as Benjamin puts: "The task of the translator consists in finding the particular intention toward the target language which produces in that language the echo of the original."²⁹⁵ If the translation in question is only concerned with maintaining its "transmitting function"²⁹⁶ it occupies one end of a spectrum of appropriation, entailing a high degree fidelity to original intention, whose extreme opposite would be a completely self-standing work of art. Benjamin would disparagingly call this "informative translation"; Nabokov would call it "literal" and would claim it is the only real kind translation

²⁹⁴ And this was the case, I repeat (cf. above, Introduction, pg. XX), of Petrine, and the Russia after Peter, with culturally distancing from the Orthodox tradition, by advancing the displays of power grounded with Western Europe and Augustan Rome.

²⁹⁵ Benjamin, 1996, pg. 258.

²⁹⁶ Ibid. pg. 253.

there is. Both are talking about the same thing: a translation governed by semantics, by the faithful rendering “as closely as the associative and syntactical capacities of another language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original”.²⁹⁷

However, Benjamin’s justification of a literary, self-standing piece of translation, invoked by the idea of the “stage of continued life” of a given literary piece, implies a different degree in the scale of adherence to a given source.²⁹⁸ This kind of translation, that Nabokov would call “paraphrastic” and, ultimately, a “profanation of the dead” is therefore an intermediary degree between an imitation that takes a given poetic model, subjecting it to its own literary purposes and a faithfully semantic literal translation. Semantics ceases to be the most important rendering target in translation to become equal with many others. Form becomes the central concern, and syntactic arrangement, figures of speech, phonemic colouring all become cornerstones on which to build a translation that seeks to be a future monument in the afterlife of a great literary work of art.

But inserted in this proposed spectrum, translation remains the humblest activity in literary practices. Even if we grant the nobility of a practice whose final product can be considered a literary work in its own right, it nevertheless is indissociable to its source, liked by a thread of fidelity that is always apparent. Translating is composing without the need for invention, for all the matter to be worked is already given in the original. It grows old, withers and with time, it is usually relegated to the inquiries of future philologists. It proves an easier task, however, especially in the literary battleground that of a language that is just starting with its many players trying to establish their names in their literary field as founding fathers. The anxiety mentioned in chapter 2 comes into play in moments such as this.

²⁹⁷ NABOKOV, in Pushkin, 1964. Pp. vii, viii.

²⁹⁸ BENJAMIN, 1996, pg. 254.

Trediakovsky was a poet specially affected by the anxiety for precedence. After losing battle after battle trying to advance his own views on form and poetic elocution as prescriptions for the new Russian language, as his favour among his peers hopelessly waned, he saw himself compelled to take ever humbler steps in his literary practices. Perhaps someone first and foremost oriented to the task of translating rather than imitating, toward the end of his career Trediakovsky increasingly focused on translation, gradually excusing himself from the arena of poetic practices. His last great enterprises were considered, by his own accounts, translations: the François Fenelon's *Aventures de Télémaque* (translated as *Tilemakhida* - 1765), and Charles Rollin's *History of Rome* (1761-1767).

Both were choices of contemporary works chosen by Trediakovsky in what he deemed would become “modern classics”, “greatly contributing to the education of the future generations in his country”.²⁹⁹ The latter was the translation of a contemporary history of Rome, undertaken by the French historian and pedagogue, Charles Rollin (1661-1741). A not very distinguished work, even for its times, Rollin's *Histoire* was devoutly translated by Trediakovsky, being among his dearest productions and one he most strenuously dedicated his efforts to.³⁰⁰ The former is a poem that freely appropriates from the Fenelon's *Les Aventures de Télémaque*, back in the day, a best-selling didactic novel in prose, covering the quest of Odysseus son, Telemachus, after his father. Concerned above all with ethical issues, it displays a very clear general theory of morality as set by 18thC. Illuminist philosophy. The translation, an example of prose to verse rendering, was Trediakovsky's last attempt at promoting the his proposal of the Russian hexametric verse, which only would be used again (with considerable

²⁹⁹ TREDIAKOVSKY, and Reyfman, 1993. pp.

³⁰⁰ Reyfman?

differences) in Gnedich's translation of the Iliad, Zhukovsky's version of the Odyssey, and Fet's translations of Horace's hexametric works.³⁰¹

Trediakovsky's both endeavours were ultimately fruitless, both in his biological and his literary afterlife.³⁰² Be it due to a mistaken appreciation of the historical value of such works, be it as a confirmation of the idiosyncrasies his detractors would not stop picking on, these last translations brought him no glory, no money, no respect. The old man increasingly saw himself as a teacher of letters, looking for at least, benefiting his future generations, what arguably did not happen as well.³⁰³

In 1753, year of his 50th birthday, he published the balance of his career so far, securing his priority in translating none other than the two most authoritative poems on how to write poems, Boileau's *Art Poétique*, and Horace's AP. His formal choices in rendering both poems reveal the versatility in the application of poetic form he strove for since the beginning, now furnished with the new theoretical understanding of the current poetic situation on matters of form, as presented in the revised manual on versification, that by now had but to accept the already consolidated the Lomonosovian practice inaugurated in 1739. In spite of it all, he now made theoretical observations that tried to revise and prove more sensible than some of Lomonosov's ideas in the 1739 Letter.

As seen, the translation of the AP is rendered in prose, always striving to be clear in meaning, going the opposite direction as the original in terms of conciseness, obscurity, tropes and figures. It was written as if it was one of his everyday letters sent to a friend or to, say, a colleague in the Academy of Sciences. This translation of the AP, therefore, occupies one end of the spectrum above stated. And in this sense, despite the astounding silence in its reception,

³⁰¹ The poet Afanasy Fet (1820-1892) carried out the first translation of Horace's Complete Works. This translation remains one of the most authoritative in

³⁰² Radishchev's account.

³⁰³

it may be justified to accept the conjecture made by Alekseeva that this was the gateway through which Russian people who did not know other languages got their first glimpse of Horace's AP.³⁰⁴ It certainly seemed very helpful to a public completely unacquainted with Ancient Antiquity, a public that would have a clearer picture of its meaning in the most difficult parts, such as the cryptic circumstantial information that abound in the original, and the literary concepts always broken down in the translation by hendiadys. This informative, semantically oriented translation was perhaps more helpful to a lay public than its antipode, the translation by Popovsky. In this sense, even if beyond the possibility of historical confirmation, he may have accomplished his objective of being a dutiful teacher.

Now, Popovksy's appropriation was a big step towards *podrazhanie*. Product of a talented versifier, whose untimely death prevented the language from having more examples of his command of model dissolution,³⁰⁵ it represents a clear example of literary translation, no longer concerned with a strict semantic rendering of the original, but now rather interested in conveying a general paraphrastic appreciation of the original, heavily constricted by the translator's formal choices, especially in view of the rhyming couplet iambic hexameters. Among the procedures adopted by Popovsky were paraphrase, disregard to circumstantial information, focus on the style of the target language, in a truly Russian poetic form. Nurtured by Lomonosov's school of inspired transported poetry, Popovsky took the same guiding principles for translation as his master, by having as the translation's governing compositional principle his chosen poetic form, with the objective of effectively producing a poem that intended to put itself in equal grounds as the original.

This was the same principle adopted by the other great translator of Horace in this generation, Ivan Barkov. His appropriation of the Satires, unfortunately not contemplated in

³⁰⁴ Alekseeva, 2006.

³⁰⁵ Remember the Pope translation. Essay on Man.

this thesis, present the same formal characteristics of the trends set by Lomonosov, in his 1747 Rhetoric and his disciples. Dating from 1763, that is, ten years after Popovsky's translation of the AP, Barkov was someone already under Lomonosov's sphere of influence.³⁰⁶ It was composed in the same iambic hexameter arranged in rhyming couplets, but now more concerned with balance between its cornerstones and philological considerations. The translation counted with several ancillary notes to help the reader navigate in such complex text as Horace's Satires and had as goal a translation that had a literary interest but presented did not exclude a didactic, informative approach.

With these translations, Popovsky, and to a lesser extent, Barkov, effectively hits the mark between the informative translation of Trediakovsky, and the imitation stances that would dominate the Horatian reception in the second half of the Century. Among the examples of such methods of appropriation are Vasily Kapnist's Horatian impersonation,³⁰⁷ Muravyov's exquisite, interspersed borrowings to his self-standing poems, and Derzhavin's free departures "in the spirit of Horace". These later instances, at least the most famous of them, are no longer considered translations according to critics and literary typologists of Russian literature, but imitation, *podrazhanie*, a product of a poet rather than a translator.³⁰⁸

Kapnist's Horatian Odes were in his own words a "imitative translation" (*podrazhatelny perevod*) of around one fourth of all Horatian lyrical output. [...] These odes were reconceptualized in his own times addressed to Kapnist's own contemporaries represented in the respective addressees of the original Horatian odes. One of them is his rendering of Odes 4.2, where the theme the impossibility of effectively emulating Pindar is transplanted into the figure of Lomonosov, contributing to the sobriquet of "Russian Pindar",

³⁰⁶ «Квинта Горация Флакка сатиры или беседы», СПб., 1763. For a complete introductory account of Barkov's life and works cf. Zorin, SXXX.

³⁰⁷ I refer to Kapnist's Horatian Odes Cf. Kapnist, 19XX. Busch, 1965, pp. 33-34.

³⁰⁸ Busch, 1965;

first given to the polymath some decades ago by Sumarokov in his Epistle Number 2, when he referred to him as “our country’s Malherbe” and “similar to Pindar”.³⁰⁹

If we take Derzhavin’s appropriation of Odes 3.30, we see a very clear example of his command of *podrazhanie* appropriating the Horatian monument to his own career as a poet. Written in his mid-career (17XX), Derzhavin starts the appropriation as a simple translation. Breaking it in four-line strophes, he underscores all the points of contact with the original in strophes 1 and 2, only to depart from it in emulation in the last two verses of the second strophe: “... and my glory will grow never waning / as long as the whole world revere the Slavic race.” Then the poet goes on to adapt all the points of contact present in Horace’s ode (the geographic extension of his glory, the deeds performed by the poet, the invocation of the muse), to his own Russian homeland, his own deeds in the poetic world, his own personal invocation of his muse. Compared to Lomonosov’s first appropriation of Odes 3.30, it is a harsh imitative departure from the original source, reconceptualizing the poem to his own purposes and extolling his own poetic achievements. Derzhavin would incorporate much from Horace in his own work and all the instances in his work of his own manners of appropriation should receive a study of its own.³¹⁰

Following this line of increasing [appropriative] dissolution] we could take one more example from another illustrious appropriator of Classic Antiquity, Mikhail Nikitich Muravyov. Muravyov was more famously known for the implementation in Russia of the Aesopian tradition carried along the linguistic traditions by Phaedrus and La Fontaine. The fables known to almost every Western child were given its Russian outfit by this poet. Needless to say, Muravyov was a great representative of Russian classicism and made several appropriations of Horace. His poem *Country live / life on the countryside, to Afanasy*

³⁰⁹ SUMAROKOV, Cf. above.

³¹⁰ Pait, 2004, inquires on problems of the reception of the Odes and Epodes in Derzhavin’s work.

Efremovich Brianchaninov, takes from Horace in the topos stated on its title, interspersing it with images and elocutions taken from some passages of the odes, but above all the from Second Epode. It is usually considered by Russian critics and scholars a “self-standing poem”, escaping the rigid, stricter division of genres established by the greatest legislative voices of Russian poetry such as Sumarokov toward a more “original, personal poem.”³¹¹ It presents interesting classification issues that deserve a more thorough scrutiny in the study of the reception of ancient classic models.

But this thesis is not about these figures from the second generation of Russian poets. This study should be left to another occasion. Meanwhile Horace’s hexametric production received more attention in the first generation, especially due to its didactic value, whether by teaching literary matters (as is the case of the AP), whether concerned in teaching ethical matters like the Satires and the Epistles.

In chapter 4 we have seen a bit of the deeds undertaken by the pioneer Antiokh Dmitrievich Kantemir. As someone who wrote before all these more famous names from the second generation, this poet remained forgotten due to the several circumstances of his life and formal choices in poetry. His translations of the Epistles suffered from an even more chronic problem of forgetfulness. His translations were completely ignored by his contemporaries, only receiving its first proper edition one hundred years after its original publication, in 1744. Nonetheless, this was a very interesting proposition for the purposes of this thesis, for it is located in another intermediary level between Trediakovsky’s informative prose translation and Popovsky’s literary adaptation, which already depart from the original. Though its formal choices are still in verse, it is not constricted by a rigid scheme of distich rhymes. This granted

³¹¹ Dedicated to Afanasy Brianchaninov, poet, playwright and husband of Muravyov’s cousin, the poem presents several difficulties to Russian scholars as to its specific generic classification. It starts with a *recusatio belli* exemplified by the Aeneid, and punctuates the poem with the several praises taken above all from Epod. 2 mixed up with verses that seemingly do not give grounds to appropriation. Cf. Muravyov, 1967, pp. 84-85. Skibina, 2010: .

Kantemir's translation a clear, balanced, fluent translation of the Epistles that sadly remained forgotten for the best part of the century and remained virtually forgotten to the appreciation of his peers. Then there was the question of the form insisted on by Kantemir as a continuation of the Slavonic tradition, having in the background a formation in Italian letters.

Unlike Trediakovsky, who had only a very basic scholastic Italian education in the elementary years of the Capuchin school in Astrakhan, and, therefore, developed his talents in a French substrate, and Lomonosov, who was rather nurtured by a German basis, Kantemir was a man of letters formed in an Italian background. It is using an Italian rationale that he displays the theoretical positions in his Khariton Makentin's letter.³¹² Both he and his elder "brother of arms", Feofan Prokopovich, were directly influenced by the Italian literary scenario, the latter having studied in Rome, formed in the Jesuit-oriented scholasticism of St. Athanasius College, the *Collegio Greco*, and the former, through the members of the Italian community that frequented his house when he was ambassador to England. Like Trediakovsky's propositions in his first letter, Kantemir's ideas on Russian poetic practices tried to bridge the literature practiced in the new language with the preceding Slavonic syllabic tradition, seasoning it with ideas taken from Italian literary practices. He would also fail in this proposing this. Instead, the dominant poetic form of the new language would be a revolutionary proposal that would bet in the complete rupture with the past, grounding its assumptions in composing "by the natural particularities of our language".³¹³

But above all, it is in the choice of blank verse that this translation can Kantemir be said to have initiated a tradition. From the great translations of Homer in early-19th C., i.e. Gnedich's Iliad and Zhukovsky's Odyssey, to the first complete translations of Horace's works by Afanasy Fet, blank verse would be the trend that would dominate most translation practices of

³¹² Especially in his defence of blank verse for translating texts from Classical Antiquity. Cf. above, pg. XX.

³¹³ This is the first corollary of Lomonosov's 1739 Letter on Versification. LOMONOSOV, PSS 8. Pg. 9.

ancient poetry after the 18th C. Due to this more flexible choice, Kantemir's translation of the Epistles would occupy the middle ground between Trediakovsky's and Popovsky's translation the AP, making it a literary translation more balanced in its points of fidelity, more closely related to semantics, while maintaining a literary quality that allows the translation to effectively count as a "posthumous monument" on the reception of Horace.

Kantemir's use of blank verse would be the standard practice in the subsequent translations of the ancient classics due to many factors beyond the reaches of this thesis. The fact is that he felt compelled to justify this choice in the preface of his translation of the Epistles. Rhymes up until the biggest part of the century were considered an essential element of poetry, regardless of the genre being practiced. Rhymes for both Trediakovsky and Lomonosov were virtually the only characteristic that set apart prose to verse, for instance, in French poetry, being one of the reasons given by both for adopting a syllabo-tonic system of versification.

Blank verse then would take a bit longer to be incorporated into Russian literary practices. Pushkin would be the first one to do so in only one genre he eventually dedicated to, drama. He was the first to break with the French classic theatre tradition, headed above all by Sumarokov's dramatic production, to present the text in couplet alexandrines, preferring instead the English arrangements that started with Elizabethan theatre. Pushkin would be the first to produce drama in blank iambic pentameters, with *Boris Godunov* and his little tragedies. But Pushkin, this sun of Russian literature, would represent much more to his language than a simple adoption of a freer poetic form. Pushkin, as already stated, raised the poetic elocution of his language to a perfect degree of maturity.

This thesis tried to present a moment in the reception of Horace in Russia and offer some reflections on the manner of appropriation of his works in a moment when the bases of a literature was being established and its first actors sought the affirmation to their names in a

novel literary field. I hope that in this thesis by presenting such a momentous time in the history of Russian literature, and tackling a few questions relative to the reception of Horace, I could have attained the objectives stated above in the Introduction.

Appendix 1 – Kantemir’s Prefaces

English Translation

Preface

Among all the ancient poetic works in Latin, I consider those of Horace to hold the very first place. Fortunate in the composition of sentences, ingenious in choosing adjectives, bold in thoughts, he represents all of them with vigor and delight. In his poems the meter corresponds to matter, relaxed and simple in the Satires and Epistles, elevated and pleasant in the Odes, always useful, composed both with admonitions and examples for the correction of morals. Therefore, his works were loved not only by Caesar Augustus and the most famous Romans, but also, they received a great appreciation by all enlightened people, in almost all countries, throughout some seventeen centuries. Thus, in view of giving our language an attempt at translating Latin verses, I thought I could not look for a better author. Among his works I have chosen the Epistles, due to their being more abundant in ethics than others. Practically every line contains some useful precept for the ordering of life. — I have translated this Epistle into unrhymed verse, so as to keep nearer to the original, from which the necessity of rhyming would often require me to depart. I know that due to the absence of rhymes such lines will not compare with others, but if they allow diligently to notice, they will find in them some measured agreement and a certain pleasant sound, which, I hope, will show that in the composition of our verses is also possible.

In this wise, versed poets from many different peoples serve as predecessors and example. Italian poets translated almost all Latin and Greek verses into such unrhymed verses (they called them *versi sciolti*). Famous among them is the translation of Vergil by Anibal Caro, and that of Lucretius by Marchetti, which are practically in no way different from the

originals. Even some of their new productions were translated with these lines, such as Trissino's *Italy Liberated* (*Italia Liberatta*). Among the English, we must not forget Milton's *Paradise Lost*. I could mention many others, if I did not guard against overextending my introduction. In many places I have preferred to translate Horace word for word, even though I felt that I was forced to use either new words or figures of expression and, therefore, not fully understandable to the reader not versed in Latin. I must apologize for this defect, as I have undertaken these translations not only for those who simply want to read the Horace Epistles in Russian and do not know Latin, but also for those who study the Latin language and wish to fully understand the original. There is yet another usefulness that comes from this: if these words and expressions come into use in the future, our language will be enriched as a result. This is an end in book translation that should not be forgotten.

I have such firm hope that my introduction of these new words and expressions do not contradict the particularities of the Russian language, that I have not neglected to clarify their force in reference notes, so these notes are necessary in order to be understandable to all. In time, these novelties will perhaps become so commonplace to the people that they will no longer need any comment. Even more necessary is to clarify the ancient customs, rituals, and other things, and also the names of personalities mentioned in the Epistles of Horace, without whom not only would the reader have little enjoyment in them, but they might even be quite unintelligible to him. As for the notes, most of them are the fruit of my own work, but most of the time I have taken them from Dacier and other commentators on Horace. If my enterprise proves pleasant to readers, it can be expected that, in time, other learned persons will not only complete the other works of Horace, but also other Roman and Latin works to our people will present, of which not a little use will arise for the diffusion of knowledge in our society, which, in part, was the only glory that it has not yet achieved.

Life of Quintus Horatius Flaccus

Quintus Horatius Flaccus was born two years prior to the conspiracy of Catiline in the second Consulship of L. Aurelius Cotta and Manlius Torquatus in Venutia, a city in the Apulia region which nowadays is called La Puglia and is part of the Kingdom of Naples. His father was a freedman and a tax collector to the State. Some add that he made a living from selling salt.

At twelve years of age, he was sent to Rome by his father and there was distinctly educated and instructed in the liberal arts at the company of several well-born young men. But it was the very example of his father that inspired in him the good behaviour, as he himself attests in gratitude in the 6th Satire of the first book.

From Rome he was sent to Athens to study philosophy and mathematics. Being in Athens still at 23 years-old, Brutus (the assassin of Julius Caesar), having a great demand for officers, withdrew him from learning to engage him in the civil war of that time and assigned him the post of military tribune, that is a colonel. Under this rank he participated in the Battle of Philippi, but dishonourably ran away from battle, having left behind his own shield.

Having Brutus's army been defeated at this battle, all Horace's estate was ascribed to the victors, Augustus and Antonius. Consequently, instigated by poverty, Horace started to dedicate himself to poetry and, so great was his success, that he became acquainted with the most illustrious Roman aristocrats, among which was Maecenas, contemporary to Augustus Caesar, to whom he was presented by the poet Vergil. Not long after, through Maecenas, he fell in the graces of Augustus, who returned to Horace not only his former estate and belongings but was as well abundantly rewarded.

Pleasant manners, sharpness of wit and the delightful conversation of Horace amused the emperor and his contemporary, that both included him to their gatherings and had in him a

sincere friend, especially Maecenas. Augustus desired to assign him to the position of his private secretary, to what he himself refused due to Horace's lazy nature, preferring to live a peaceful life to having all that glory.

Inclined to quietude of mind and to freshness, he willingly spend his time in his suburban villa in Tibur and in the region of Tarento, from whence he would lazily return to Rome on the frequent insistence of his friends or on the utmost necessity of his affairs. He loved moderate meals, with clean table settings, apparel and house. He was inclined to the feminine sex and to the 50 years of age was jolly in conversation, cheerful, loved to have all freedom to speak and in consequence, always looked to party only with his most trusted friends.

Short of stature and fat, grey before his 40's, feeble of health, frequently suffered above all from his eyes, Horace died at 57 and was interred close to Maecenas grave in Rome, having left all his estate to Augustus Caesar. Horace's works that reached us were 5 books of songs/odes, plus a song/ode named *Carmen Saeculare*, two books of satires, two books of letters (epistles) and a letter on the art of poetry. All these compositions from the times of Augustus to our era gained an extraordinary fame and prestige and both ancient and modern writers recognise that Horace displayed in them an exceptional sharpness of wit, a great force and delight in expression and a particular art in making the things agree with their respective words.

Portuguese Translation

Prefácio

Dentre todas as obras poéticas antigas em latim, considero que as de Horácio detêm o primeiríssimo lugar. Afortunado na composição de sentenças, engenhoso na escolha dos adjetivos, ousado nos pensamentos, ele os representa com vigor e deleite. Em seus poemas o

metro corresponde à matéria, descontraído e simples nas Sátiras e Epístolas, elevado e agradável em suas Odes, sempre útil, composto tanto com admoestações e exemplos para a correção dos costumes. Por isso, suas obras foram amadas não apenas por César Augusto e os mais famosos romanos, como também, por cerca de dezessete séculos, por todas as gentes ilustradas, em quase todos os países, receberam um grande apreço. Por isso, querendo eu dar a nossa língua uma tentativa de tradução de versos latinos, considerei que não poderia procurar autor melhor. Dentre suas obras, escolhi as Epístolas, de modo que elas são mais do que as outras abundantes na ética. Praticamente cada linha contém algum preceito útil para o ordenamento da vida. – [Traduzi estas Epístola em versos sem rimas, de modo a manter-me mais próximo do original, do qual a necessidade de rimas frequentemente exigiria que me afastasse. Sei que por esta ausência de rimas tais versos não se compararão aos outros, mas se elas permitirem diligentemente notar, encontrarão nelas alguma concordância comedida e certo som agradável, que, espero mostrará que na composição de nossos versos ela é também possível.]

Nisso, poetas versados de muitos povos nos servem de predecessores e exemplo. Poetas italianos traduziram quase todos os latinos e gregos em tais versos sem rimas (chamavam-no *versi sciolti*). Famosa entre eles é a tradução de Virgílio por Anibal Caro, e a de Lucrécio por Marchetti, as quais praticamente em nada destoam dos originais. Mesmo algumas produções originais deles foram traduzidas nesses versos, tal como a Itália Liberada (*Italia Liberatta*) de Trissino. Entre os ingleses, não devemos nos esquecer de Paraíso Perdido de Milton. Poderia mencionar muitos outros, se não me resguardasse de estender minha introdução [fala]. Em muitos lugares preferi traduzir Horácio palavra por palavra, ainda que tenha sentido que fui obrigado a usar ou palavra ou figuras de expressão novas e, por isso, não totalmente compreensíveis ao leitor não versado em língua latina. Por este defeito peço desculpas, pois empreendi estas traduções não apenas para aqueles que querem ler simplesmente as Epístolas

Horácio em língua russa e não sabem o latim, mas também para aqueles que estudam a língua latina e desejam compreender totalmente o original. Há ainda outra utilidade que disso provém: se no futuro estas palavras e expressões entrarem em uso, por conta disso, nossa língua se enriquecerá. Esse é um fim na tradução de livros que não deve ser esquecido.

Tenho tão firme esperança de que a introdução destas novas palavras e expressões não contradizem as particularidades da língua russa, que não deixei de esclarecer sua força em notas de referência; de modo a serem compreensíveis a todos estas notas se fizeram necessárias. Com o tempo, estas novidades tornar-se-ão, talvez, tão corriqueiras ao povo que não precisarão mais de nenhum comentário. Mais necessário ainda é esclarecer os costumes antigos, rituais e outras coisas, e também os nomes de personalidades que as Epístolas de Horácio mencionam, sem as quais não apenas o leitor pouco desfrutaria delas, mas também poderia mesmo serem de todo ininteligíveis. Para as notas, a maior parte é fruto de meu próprio trabalho, mas em boa parte das vezes as tomei de Dacier e outros comentadores de Horácio.

Se minha empreitada se mostrar aprazível aos leitores, pode-se esperar que, com o tempo, outras pessoas dotas não apenas completarão as outras obras de Horácio mas também outras obras romanas e em latim a nosso povo apresentarão, das quais surgirá não pouco uso para a difusão dos saberes em nossa sociedade, que, em parte foi a única glória ainda não alcançada.

VIDA DE QUINTO HORÁCIO FLACO

Quinto Horácio Flaco nasceu dois anos antes da conjuração de Catilina, no segundo consulado de L. Aurélio e Mânlio Torquato, em Venúsia, cidade da região (província? уезд) da Apúlia, que hoje se chama La Pullia e consiste em uma parte do Reino de Nápoles. Seu pai foi um liberto e coletor de impostos do governo. Alguns afirmam que ganhava o sustento com a venda de sal.

Aos dez anos de idade foi enviado pelo pai a Roma e lá foi formado honrosamente, aprendendo as artes liberais em companhia de muitos meninos de alta extração. Porém o pai com seu próprio exemplo e os preceitos que passou fundamentou nele os bons costumes, como o próprio testemunha com gratidão na Sátira 6, Livro 1.

De Roma foi mandado para Atenas a fim de estudar filosofia e matemática. Estando em Atenas, ainda aos 23 anos de idade, Brutus (o assassino de Júlio César), por conta da grande necessidade de oficiais, desviou-o das ciências para a guerra civil de então e o designou como tribuno militar, ou por outra, um coronel. Nesta patente ele participou da batalha de Filipos, mas fugiu vergonhosamente à batalha, tendo abandonado seu escudo.

Tendo sido o contingente de Brutus batido nessa batalha, toda a propriedade de Horácio tornou-se espólio dos vencedores, Augusto e Antônio, e com isso, despertado pela pobreza, passou a se dedicar a escrever versos e a tal ponto exceu que travou conhecimento com os mais famosos fidalgos romanos, entre os quais, o contemporâneo de Augusto César, Mecenas, a quem foi apresentado por intermédio de Virgílio. Pouco depois, por meio de Mecenas, caiu nas graças de Augusto, por quem não apenas foram retornados sua fazenda e seus pertences, mas ainda inclusive foi abundantemente condecorado.

Os hábitos agradáveis, a agudeza de pensamento e a doçura da conversa de Horácio tanto foram amadas pelo imperador e seu contemporâneo, que ambos o incluíam a suas diversões e tinham por ele uma sincera amizade, especialmente Mecenas. Augusto até desejou honrá-lo com o posto de secretário particular, que ele por sua vez não quis, devido a Horácio ser por natureza preguiçoso e preferir uma vida tranquila à glória absoluta.

Propenso à tranquilidade de mente e ao frescor, passava de boa vontade seu tempo em suas casas de campo em Tíbur e na região de Tarento, de onde voltava a Roma deveras

preguiçosamente pela frequente insistência de seus bem feitos ou por extremas necessidades de seus amigos. Gostava de uma alimentação comedida, mas aparatos de mesa, roupas e a casa [sempre] limpos. Era afeito ao sexo feminino e até os cinquenta anos de idade era alegre nas conversas, espirituoso, gostava de gozar de plena liberdade de expressão e, por isso, buscava festejar somente com seus amigos mais confiáveis.

Era baixo de altura e gordo, grisalho antes dos quarenta anos, fraco de compleição, frequentemente padecia dos olhos, morreu aos 57 anos e foi enterrado ao lado de Mecenas, deixando como seu herdeiro Augusto César. As obras que dele nos chegaram são cinco livros de canções, mais uma canção de título *Carmen Saeculare*, dois livros de sátiras, dois livros de cartas, e uma carta sobre a arte de fazer versos. Todas essas obras desde os tempos augustanos até os nossos gozaram de um excepcional louvor e estima, e os mais famosos escritores, tanto antigos como novos, reconhecem que Horácio neles demonstrou uma acentuada agudeza de mente, grande força e graça nas expressões e uma especial arte em concertar a coisa com sua palavra correspondente.

Appendix 2

a. Trediakovsky's Translation of the AP

ГОРАЦИЯ ФЛАККА «ЭПИСТОЛА К ПИЗОНАМ О СТИХОТВОРЕНИИ И ПОЭЗИИ»³¹⁴ С ЛАТИНСКИХ СТИХОВ ПРОЗОЮ

Если б живописец присовокупил к человеческой голове конскую шею, а на все б тело навел красками разных птиц перья, собрав от всех животных члены так, чтоб прекрасная

³¹⁴ В предисловии объявлено мною, что Гораций все свои правила взял из Аристотелевы «Поэтики», но, сверх того, много он выбрал, по свидетельству Порфирионову, из Критона, Зенона, Демокрита, и особливо из Неоптолема Паросского.

сверху женская особа имела мерзким видом черный рыбий хвост, то, будучи пущены смотреть такую живописную картину, можете ль вы, дражайшие друзья, удерживаться от смеха? Извольте ж поверить, о! Пизоны,³¹⁵ что сей картине весьма подобна будет книга, в которой наподобие больного человека сновидениям тщетные и пустые изобразятся виды и в коей ни начало, ни конец не имеют между собою сходства и соединения. Правда, я знаю, что живописцы и пииты всегда имели равную власть дерзать на все в своем художестве, а вольности сея и я сам себе прошу, и даю ее другим взаимно; однако не толь самовольно и дерзновенно, чтоб уже тихое совокуплять с беспокойным или змиев сопрягать бы с птицами, а с тиграми агнцев.

Часто к важным и великим повествованиям пришивается одна или по крайней мере две блистающие заплаты из парчи багряного цвета, когда или священный лесок Дианин, или ея жертвенник, или приближающиеся воды быстрым разлитием проведение и окружение по веселым полям, или реки Рен, или дожденосная описывается радуга. Однако всем тем украшениям не было тут приличного тогда места. Но может быть только 20 и умения в таком художнике, что он искусен малевать одни кипарисы. Что ж сей живописец учинить имеет, когда его кто-нибудь из бедных мореплавателей по сокрушении и потере корабля просит намалевать бедствие свое и спасение от потопления? И понеже начата корчага, то чего ради на вертящемся колесе выделяется кувшин? Впрочем, что сочинить вы хотите, то было б токмо просто³¹⁶ и одно в себе, ибо мы, пииты, по самой большей части, — о, отец! и юноши, достойные отца, — обманываемся видом правоты и исправности в вещах. Ежели я стараюсь быть

³¹⁵ Приписано сие наставление Луцию Пизону и его двум сынам, а сей Луций был консул в 739 годе от создания Рима, торжествовал над взбунтовавшимися Фракианами в 743, был управителем в Риме после Статилия-Тавра чрез двадцать лет и умер верховным понтифексом в 786 годе, имея от рождения 80 лет. Историки похваляют его попремногу.

³¹⁶ Все Горациевы правила касаются токмо до эпического и до драматического поэмы, о прочих говорит он токмо мимоходом. Но в тех самое первое, главное и как грунтовое правило есть простота и единство, которые совершенно противны тому, что Гораций говорил выше. Неприличные и посторонние описания повреждают их и истребляют: ничему чужому и непристойному нет места в сочинении. Должно в сем последовать Гомеру, Виргилию и Софоклу, у коих все кажется нужным и необходимым.

сократителен, то темен и непонятен бываю; буде ж устремительно бегу за ясностию, то недостает во мне сил и духа. 30 Кто важное и великое начинает, тот напыщается, но кто больше надлежащего бури и волнения боится, тот ползает по земле. Кто притом и различным образом щедро желает испестрить вещь, тот дельфина в лесу изображает, а вепря в море. К пороку приводит бегание от порока, если оно не имеет искусства. Статуарный художник, живущий близ так называемого места, Эмилиево мечебитное училище,³¹⁷ хотя и ногти, и мягкие волосы изрядно изобразит на меди, но вся его статуя неудачна и несчастлива, для того что не вся сделана искусно. Сему художнику толь я подобен быть желаю в рассуждении моего сочинения, коль охотно мне жить с скверным носом, имеющему только и красоты, что в черных очах и кудрях.

Писатели! выбирайте равную силам вашим материю и, чрез долгое время обращая ее, рассматривайте, чего понести не могут и что рамена ваши снести имеют. Кому удастся выбрать по своим силам дело, тот не будет иметь недостатка в красноречии, того также не оставит и чистый порядок в расположении. Доброта и красота порядка в сем состоять имеет, или я обманываюсь, чтоб предлагать токмо то, что прилично делу, а иное многое на другое откладывать время; чтоб надлежащее любить, а неприличное презирать автору обещанныя целыя поэмы. Притом, в словах рассудительны и осторожны, вы весьма можете изобразить речь, когда известное слово новым сделаете чрез соединение с другим. Итак, ежели по случаю надобно будет описать вновь тайное и сокровенное в вещах и вымышлять неслыханные слова самым древним римским обывателям, то можно дать на них вольность, буде она умеренно употребится, ибо новые

³¹⁷ Гораций означает здесь некоторого художника статуй, жившего за цирком, близ места, называемого Эмилиево училище, для того что тут Эмилий Лепид учил прежде того гладиаторов, где по многим времени Поликлет построил всенародную баню.

и ныне вымышленные слова будут иметь силу, если с несколькоо скупостию от греческих источников произведутся и учинятся латинскими. Чего б ради римлянам то ныне отнимать у Virgiliya и Вария, что они прежде позволили Цецилию и Плавту? Для чего ж и мне запрещать, буде я в состоянии вымыслить несколько новых слов, когда Катонов и Энниев язык обогатил отечественное наше слово и новые вещам имена наложил?

Сие как вольно было, так и всегда будет вольно. Равно как на лесах листы переменяются ежегодным старых опадением, так слов древний век погибает и, наподобие молодых людей, родившись, они процветают и приходят с возрастом в силу. Мы все и все ваше подвержено пременам и смерти. Видим и море, пущенное на землю, которое корабли в Лукринской гавени³¹⁸ защищает от жестоких ветров царскою силою и иждивением; видим и Помтинское чрез долгое время неплодоносное болото³¹⁹ и токмо способное к восприятию плавания судами, ныне ближние питающее города и тяжелым орющееся плутом; видим, что и река Тибр кривое переменила течение,³²⁰ повреждавшее плоды, и узнала лучший путь. Все человеческие и дела исчезнут, не то чтоб словам пребывать всегда в чести и иметь всегдашнюю живность в красоте и приятности. Многие паки родятся, которые уже упали, и упадут названия, находящиеся ныне в почтении, ежели восхощет и благоволит употребление, которое токмо одно имеет власть и право, и правило, как говорить.

³¹⁸ Озеро Авернийское было разделено от Лукринского. Агриппа перекопал то место и собшил одно с другим в 717 годе от создания Рима, да и построил там великолепную гавень, назвав ее Portus Iulius, гавень Иулиева, в честь Августа, который назывался еще тогда Иулий Октавиан просто.

³¹⁹ Не было еще, может быть, двадцати или тридцати лет от того, как Август осушил Помтинское болото посредством канала длиною, почитай, в 23 версты и выпустил воду в море. По сему точно каналу Гораций плыл в 717 годе от создания Рима, когда он ехал в Бринд.

³²⁰ Агриппа по Августову указу поделал каналы, в кои убиралась вода реки Тибра, потоплявшая прежде Велабр и все поля.

Деяния царей и полководцев, также и печальные брани, каким стихом и велелепием могут описываться, то показал Гомер. Стихами, неравно сочетанными, прежде жалость, но потом и успех, сбывшийся по желанию, пииты начали предлагать; однако кто первый изобрел небольшую элегию, о том споруются ученые люди, и ныне еще их пря решения не получила. Неистовая ярость вооружила Архилоха собственным ему ямбом. После его изобретения сею стопою начали падать комедии и важные трагедии, для того что она способна к изображению театральных бесед и к преодолению народного шума своим звоном, так что как родилась на представляемые вещи действием. Лирическим струнам определила муза воспевать богов и божеских чад, и борющегося победителя, и коня в ристальном подвиге первого, и юношеские от любви мучения, и своевольные вина и пирования. Ежели я не умею и не могу по различию вещей различать стиль, то почему меня должно называть пиитом? Чего ж ради я больше незнанием несправедливо стыжусь, нежели стараюсь?

Комическое действие не хочет представляемо быть трагическим слогом; равно ж негодует и всякая трагедия, буде она повествуется простыми и комедии приличными стихами. Всякой вещи должно иметь свою благопристойность и быть на том месте, где каждой свойственно. Однако иногда возносит голос и комедия, так что и в ней гневающийся Хремет³²¹ пышным

³²¹ Хремет трагическим говорит голосом, когда он кричит на сына своего Клитифона в 4 явлен., действ. 5
Теренциевы комедии, названные «Геавтонтиморуменос» (Сам к себе угрюм):

...Non si ex capite sis meo

Natus, item ut aiunt Minervam esse ex love, ea caussa magis

Patiar, Clitipho, flagitiis tuis me infamem (ieri).

То есть:

«Нет, Клитифон: хотя б ты так вышел из моего головы, как объявляют о Минерве, что она произошла из Иовишевы, однако я не буду терпеть, чтоб ты меня бесчестил твоим непотребством». Также и в «Аделфах» (в двух равных братах) Демей говорит высоко в явлен. 3, действ. 5:

Nei mihi! quid faciam? quid agam? quid clamem? aut querar?

O! caelum, o! terra, o! maria Neptuni.

То есть:

«Ах, горе! что мне делать? куда обратиться? что возопить? какую приносить жалобу? о! небо, о! земля, о! моря великого Нептуна».

ссорится словом; напротив того, часто и трагическое лицо скорбь свою изъясняет пешеходными речами.³²² Телеф и Пелей,³²³ оба из царей, пришедшие в бедность и бывшие в изгнании, на театре отвергают надутые и полторафутные слова, желая привести в сожаление зрителево сердце. Недовольно того, чтоб поэмам быть только изрядным, надобно, чтоб притом они были и сладки и полезны, и обращали б, куда хотят, в слушателя сердечные пристрастия. Как с смеющимися зрители смеются, так должно, чтоб они и с плачущими то ж имели человеческое чувство и показывали б оное на лице явно. Буде ты Телеф, или ты Пелей, худоданные вам слова от автора выговариваете, то я или дремать стану, или буду смеяться.

Жалостные речи печальному лицу приличны; гневающемуся — исполненные гроз; играющему — забавные и любовные; постоянному, наконец, — важные. Ибо сама природа изображает в нас прежде приличие всякому состоянию тем, что иногда она приводит нас к благосклонности, иногда на гнев побуждает или на землю несносною повергает печалию, а в радости воздвигает сердечные движения изъяснением языка. Ежели повествующего слова несогласны будут с его состоянием, то конные и пешие римские граждане будут ему в лицо свистать и смеяться. Того ради весьма прилежно наблюдать надобно, бог ли какой говорит или герой; зрелый ли старостию человек или еще цветущею младостию кипящий; сильная ль

³²² Мнится, что трагедии меньше случаев к простым и народным словам, нежели комедия может говорить высоко. Не токмо в гневе, но и во всякой наглой страсти употребляет она высоту. В Теренциевом «Евнухе» Херей в превеликой своей радости говорит так при окончании 5 действ., что не стыдно б отнюдь и трагедии было иметь такую речь. Что ж до трагедии, то она, кажется, долженствует быть проста в скорби токмо, как то Гораций наставляет и по нем Деппео.

³²³ Телеф и Пелей, один сын Геркулесов, а другой Ахиллесов отец, когда они оба лишены были наглостию своих областей, то принуждены нашлись просить покорнейше и в бедном состоянии милости и помощи у Греческих государей. Сие самое подало материя Эврипиду к двум трагедиям, как то видно из многих мест комедии Аристофановы, названной «Жабы», или «Лягушки».

госпожа или неусыпная кормилица; купец ли странствующий или оратай
зеленеющиеся нивы; колхидянин ли или ассирианин; в Тебах ли воспитанный или в
Аргосе рожденный.

Писатели! или предлагайте ведомую всем повесть, или приличную вымышляйте
и вероятную. Ежели почтенного представляете Ахиллеса, то б он был устремителен,
гневлив, непреклонен, храбр и силен; говорил бы, что он не подвержен уставам и что
нет того, которое не должно б было уступать оружию. Чтоб Медея была свирепа и
непреодолема, чтоб Ина слезлива, чтоб Иксион вероломен, Иа повсюду скитающаяся,
а печален и мрачен был бы Орест. Когда что небывалое прежде на театр выводите и
дерзаете представить новое лицо, то б оно таково было до самого конца, каково сперва
явилось, и всегда б свойство свое хранило.

Хотя и трудно обще многими описанную материю собственным отличить
сочинением, однако вы исправнее можете Троянскую ведомую повесть представлять
действием, нежели предлагать неизвестное и прежде не описанное. Общая материя
имеет быть собственною вашею, когда в ея просторном округе искусно станете
обращаться, когда не от слова до слова верно переводить имеете и когда подражанием и
в такую тесноту не зайдете, от которой вам отстать стыд запрещает или закон
предприятю дела.

Блудитесь начинать так поэму, как площадной в древние времена
начал писатель.³²⁴ *Я воспою Приамову фортуна и благородную брань.*³²⁵

³²⁴ Некто из древних римских пиитов, коего имени Гораций нам не объявляет, сочинил поэму о Троянской войне, где он вел всю Приамову историю порядком от рождения его до смерти, не отступая ни к какому эпизоду. Таковы точно поэмы «Превращения» Овидиевы и «Ахиллеида» Стациева. Единство героев и действия не находится в первом, а второй хотя и предлагает действия одного токмо героя, но действия сии не связываются между собою и не клонятся к одному главному, которому б их все соединить.

³²⁵ Сие есть начало поэмы, содержащая всю Приамову историю, чего ради сей пиит и назван **круговым** в Горации, коего я перевел площадным. И понеже Гораций осмеяет сие предложение, то как бы уже он стал смеяться над Стацием, включившим в свою поэму всю Ахиллесову историю, как то сказывают о Мевии, что в своей поэме описал он всю Приамову, которого, может быть, и называет Гораций круговым. Стаций так начал «Ахиллеиду»: Magnanimum Aeacidem, formidatamque Tonanti Progeniem, et vetitam patrio succedere caelo,

Что ж сей обещатель принесет нам потом достойное толикого зевания? 140
 Ничего, как токмо что силятся родить горы, а родиться имеет смеха достойная мышь. О!
 коль исправнее Гомер, который ничего не предуготовляет на ветер, и некстати: *Поведай*
мне, — воспевает он, — *Муза, того мужа, который после времен взятия Трои многих*
*человеков видел нравы и городы*³²⁶ Сей не дым из блистания, но из дыма помышляет
 дать свет, чтоб ему в последовании великолепные предложить чудеса, а именно:
 Антифата, Сциллу и с Циклопом Харибду. Не начинается он Диомедова возвращения от
 Мелеагровы смерти, ни Троянская войны от двойного Лединого яичного порождения.
 Всегда к окончанию поспешает, а к тем вещам, которым надлежит быть в середине, так
 передним повествованием похищает читателя, как будто б оные были уже ему известны;
 но о чем отчаивается, что оно не способно может воспринять украшения, то оставляет
 и таким образом вымышляет и мешает праведное с подобным правде, чтоб
 середине с началом, а с серединою б концу быть согласну.

Вы, чего б я и со мною народ желал, послушайте. Ежели хотите иметь
 себе похваляющего плескателя, который ожидает открытия театру и сидел бы он до того
 времени и до того самого слова, коим некоторое из действующих лиц при окончании
 объявляет: «Вы плещите!», то надобно вам наблюдать каждого возраста нравы, также и
 естество, пребывающее всегда в движении и переменяющееся, и притом лет приличную
 осанку и свойство. Отрок, который уже стал говорить и незыблущимися ногами ходить
 по земле, тот охотится играть совокупно с сверстниками, и как он гневается безрассудно,

Diva refer...

То есть:

«Великодушного Ахиллеса и страшное Гремящему порождение, которому не было судьбы наследником быть под
 отечественным небом, богиня воспой». Надобно чрезвычайное стремительство, чтоб не уронить до самого конца
 поэмы влагаемого мнения о герое, страшном самому Юпитеру.

³²⁶ Гораций предлагает здесь сокращенно первые три стиха Гомеровы «Одиссеи»:

ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, μοῦσα, πολύτροπος ὃς μάλα πόλλα
 πλάγχθη ἐπεὶ Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον ἔπερσε
 πόλλων δ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄσρα (SIC) καὶ νόον ἔγνων.

То есть:

«Возвести мне, Муза, многообратившегося (мудрого, благоразумного) мужа, который, странствовал чрез долгое
 время по разорении священныя Трои, познал нравы и был в градах многих народов».

так и гнев оставляет, переменяясь ежечасно. Безбородый юноша после, как отлучат от него дядьку, веселится лошадьми, тешится псами, всегда пребывая в чистом поле, сей как воцанный к восприятию изображения в сердце от пороков и к преклонению себя на злое; увещателям непокорив, полезных вещей медленный предусмотритель и промыслитель, расточителен на деньги, высокомерен, самомнителен и любовною страстию кипящ, а любимое отвергать устремителен. Противным сему пристрастием век и мужеское сердце ищет богатства и дружбы, старается в честь произойти, хранит себя от такого дела, от которого ему скоро отстать будет нужда. Многие беспокойства окружают престарелого человека или для того, что он ищет, а от полученного, бедный, воздерживается и боится оное употреблять, или для сего, что он всякое дело с опасностью и с холодною медленностию отправляет, будучи отлагатель на иное время, далек надеждою, ленив, желателен будущего, несговорчив, кропотлив, хвалитель прошедших времен и что он еще в отрочестве был смотритель за всеми и всех исправлял. Восходящие лета многие выгоды приносят с собою, а нисходящие уносят многие.

Того ради, чтоб не дать должности состаревшегося человека молодому, всегда долженствуем смотреть обстоятельства, приличные летам, хотя б действие на театре представлялось, хотя ж бы оно и повестью предлагаемо было. Не толь скоро слова, вложенные в слухи, возбуждают сердца, коль вещи, представленные нелгушим очам и которые смотритель сам себе и понятию своему предает. Однако для сего ж самого не извольте того представлять на театре, чему должно быть за оным, и многое укрывайте от очей, что объявить может вскоре присутствующее краснословие. Чтоб Медея не убивала детей своих пред народом, и также не варил бы явно человеческия плоти скверный Атрей, или чтоб не превращалась Прокна в птицу, а Кадм в змия: все, что

мне подобное сему представляется, я, не веря тому, ненавижу оно. Вся та драматическая поэма, чтоб ни больше ни меньше пяти действий не имела,³²⁷ которую желаете, дабы просили к представлению и после смотра паки б охотились видеть ее повторенную на театре. Чтоб никакого бога помощи в действии не было, разве достойный будет узел толь великого истолкователя. Четвертое лицо никогда ж бы совокупно не говорило. Чтоб хор действующих лиц свойство и мужественную должность защищал; сей хор, бывающий по окончании действий, всегда б согласен был с представленным действием и с ним бы прилично соединялся. Хор да благоприятствует добрым и да подает совет друзьям; хор да исправляет гневливых и да любит боящихся грешить; он да хвалит пищу непродолжительного стола, он да прославляет спасительное правосудие, уставы и спокойный мир во время отверстых Янусовых врат; он вверенное да укрывает и да просит и молит богов, чтоб возвратилось к бедным счастье, а ушло б оно от гордых.

Свирель не такая была, какая ныне золотом и серебром оправленная и подобная трубе, но небольшая и простая, имеющая немного ладов, которая приятно соглашалась с пением хора и довольна была на услышание всем, когда еще скамьи не весьма тесно имели сидящий на себе народ, который и сам приходил смотреть, будучи непорочен, чист и кроток.

³²⁷ Драматическая поэма не толь долга, коль эпическая, причина сему, что первая представляется, а другая читается. Чего ради первой надобно стало иметь предписанные пределы, так чтоб действию иметь все время к развязанию себя и не утрудить бы внимания и терпеливости зрителей. На сие за довольное почтено пяти действий; а Гораций и запрещает быть им как в меньшем, так и в большем числе. Следовательно, три действия италиянские есть погрешность. Впрочем, греки о сем разделении на пять действий нигде не говорили. Но Аристотелево деление сходствует всеконечно с пятью действиями. Называет он предисловием, что мы первым действием; вступлением, что у нас делается в трех следующих; исходом, что в наших есть пятое действие. Ориген и святой Григорий Назианзин утверждают, что Саломоновы «Песни Песней» брачная есть **Драма**. Некоторые присовокупляют, что она точно разделена на пять частей. Если сие правда, то евреи знали драматические поэмы в пять действий за шестьсот лет прежде Аристотеля.

После, как победители римские начали распространять земли, город Рим окружать обширнейшими стенами, и вином и пированием все обыватели стали забавляться небоязненно в праздничные дни, то получила и мусикия большее своеволие в игрании и в играемых штуках. Ибо чем бы другим увеселять себя грубому и праздному земледельцу, смешавшемуся с гражданином, бездельнику — с честным человеком? Сея ради причины к древнему искусству прибавил музыкант и движение, и роскошь, волоча уже долгия своя одежды воскрилия по всем местам оркестры, от сего и постоянные прежде струны получили себе нежное и умильное согласие, от сего устремительное слово произвело необыкновенное и странное красноречие, также и полезных вещей прежде изобретательница, божественная философия, подобна стала быть в словах неистово прорицательному делфическому Аполлину.

Которые трагическими стихами, чтоб себе получить в воздаяние гнусного козла, препирались, те вскоре также присовокупили и лесных сатиров а, не повреждая важности, шутку покусились ввести в трагедию, ибо надлежало приманивать зрителя и приятною новостью удерживать, кой по священной должности был уже и сыт, и пьян, и своеволен. Однако так должно выводить на театр насмешников, так прилично велеречивых сатиров, так мешать игрушку с важностию, чтоб, кто бог, кто будет герой, в царском прежде бывши златом одеянии, не пременился притом простым весьма словом в незнатного харчевника, или чтоб, убегая, ползать по земле, не хватал исчезающих облаков и всего того, что пустое. Трагедия недостойна того, чтоб ей легкомысленные произносить стихи, надобно ей так умеренно и стыдливо с сатирическою поступать шуткою, как честная госпожа по повелению пляшет во время торжественных дней. Я, писатель сатир, не токмо в них не буду любить некрасные и несвойственные каждой вещи имена

и слова, но и так не потщусь от трагического различаться изображением, чтоб великой быть разности, когда Дав говорит подлый и смелая Питиа, которая, обманувши Симона, господина своего, получила целый талант на приданое дочери, и, когда произносит речь Силен, охранитель и воспитатель питомца своего, бога Бакхуса.³²⁸ Я из ведомья всем материи напишу сатирический стих так, что всяк может уповать сделать то ж, но не всяк, хотя б сколько потел, будет уметь получить в том успех. Толико-то сильно есть расположение и приличное соединение! Толико-то простой материи прибывает чести! По моему совету, выведенные из лесов Фауны и Сатиры пускай берегутся, чтоб им не быть подобным народу и мещанам, чтоб не чрез лишек молодеть и юношествовать стихами, являющими негу, и чтоб также не сквернословить нечистыми и бесчестными речами; ибо такими словами гнушаются конные граждане, сенаторы и богатые римские особы, и не всегда за то похваляют и жалуют, что любо продавцу свежего гороху и орехов.

Долгий слог после краткого называется ямбом. Сия стопа весьма скоро, от чего и называются триметрами ямбические стихи, хотя и шесть мер и ударений имеют, для того что две стопы за одну почитаются. Сперва во всех местах ямбический стих одним токмо состоял ямбом и был с начала до конца себе подобен. Почитай, недавно, чтоб ему несколько медленнейшему и важнейшему входить в слухи, принял он в собственное свое наследие постоянную стопу, называемую спондеем; однако так, чтоб во втором и четвертом месте быть непременно ямбу. Сей и в Акциевых благородных триметрах, и в Энниевых весьма редко является. И хотя народ на театре предлагаемые стихи с великим величанием и такие, кои или излишнюю поспешностию сочинены и нетщательно, или и

³²⁸ Все древние представили нам Силена стариком, морщиноватым, плешивым, плосконосым и имевшим долгую бороду. Он у них наставником и питателем Бакхусовым, чего ради и Орфей начинает свою песнь Силену следующим стихом: κλύθι μοι, ὦ πολύσεμνε τροφέϋ, Βάκχοιο τίτηνέ.
То есть:
Послушай меня, о! многопочтенный, отец Бакхов питательный.

совсем неискусно, осуждает и всячески хулит, однако не всяк рассудить может, в чем бездельных поэм состоит порок. Для того и попущено, но несправедливо, римским пиитам писать, как хотят. И понеже сие так, то уже посему и мне можно скитаться по ветру и сочинять своевольно? Или даром, хотя знаю, что все будут видеть мои погрешения, однако я безопасен и защищен данною вольностью? Словом сказать, сие значит, что я преступления не учинил, но не заслужил же и похвалы. Для избежания от сих пороков вы обращайтесь греческие сочинения денною, обращайтесь и нощною рукою. Что ж наши прадеды Плавтовы как стихи, так и шутки похваляли, то обоему с излишнюю терпеливостию, чтоб не сказать нерассудностию, удивлялись они, когда ныне я и вы умеем уже различить неучтивое слово с забавным, и не токмо руками прикасаемся к законному звону, но и слухом оный внушаем.

Повествуют, что неведомый по то время трагическия Музы род изобрел Теспис, что он в телеге прежде повсюду возил свои поэмы и что его игроки и пели, и говорили словом, вымазавши лица свои дрожжами. По нем настал Эсхиль, изобретатель благопристойныя личины и епанчи, который невысокий театр выстлал досками и научил, как высоким слогом о важных делах говорить, так и бодро поступать в трагическом украшении. За сими двумя трагедиями следовала так называемая старая комедия, не без получения себе довольныя похвалы, но в порок вольность ея обратилась, так что наглость оная достойною нашли воздержать законом. Запрещение принято, и бесстыдный хор замолчал, для того что отнято у него право к повреждению честных людей.

Наши пииты ничего не оставили сочинениями своими, так что не меньшую заслужили похвалу, дерзнувши оставить греческие следы и начавши прославлять домашние дела как теми комедиями, которые называются *претекстаты*, так и оными, кои именуются *тогаты*. И поистине, столько ж бы сильныя сделался Рим и красноречием Афин, сколько добродетелями и

оружием, ежели б всяк из наших пиитов не отвращался от труда в исправлении и имел бы в том терпеливость.

Но вы, о! Пизоны, происшедшие от крови Нумы Помпилия, осуждайте тот стих, которого долгое время и многое чернение не исправляли, а и десятию выправленного еще не привели в целое совершенство. Пускай Демокрит думает, что природа благополучнее бедных науки,³²⁹ и потому пускай выключает из числа пиитов и отлучает от Геликона тех, которые здраво обучены, а оных почитает пиитами, кои умышленно неистовствуют, для того что знатная и самая большая часть из них ногтей не обрезавают, бороды не бреют и живут в уединении, от общих собраний убегая. Посему тот токмо получить имеет имя пиита и за то почтение, кто ни от трех сильных проносных неисцелимыя своя головы никогда не давал стричь бритовщику Лицину.³³⁰ О! весьма я безумен, что при наступлении весны очищаю от желчи свой желудок; ибо никто б другой не мог сочинить лучших поэм, ежели б я не имел попечения о здравии, ежели б я волос не стриг, бороды не брил и ежели б я ногтей не обрезывал. Однако почитая, впрочем, мнение Демокритово, я послужу вместо оселки, которая способна к изошрению ножей, хотя и не может сама резать. Сам ничего не сочиняя, покажу, где надлежит получать матерiu, чем ее распространить и украшать, каким способом пиит может получить совершенство в своем искусстве, что пристойно и что неприлично, куда приводит наставление и куда заблуждение заносит.

³²⁹ Диоген Лаэртский объявляет, что сей философ издал между прочими своими трудами два сочинения, из которых одно о поэзии, а другое о красоте стихов. Может быть, что в котормнибудь из тех сочинений говорил он то, что Гораций здесь о нем сказывает.

³³⁰ Сей Лицин был славный бритовщик, коего Август произвел в сенаторское достоинство, в награждение за ненависть его к Помпею. Ему точно сочинен следующий эпиграфий:

Marmoreo tumulo Licinus iacet; at Calo nullo:

Pompeius parvo. Quis putet esse deos?

То есть:

«Лицин лежит в мраморном гробе; Катон ни в каком; Помпей в небольшом. Кто ж помнит, что суть боги?»

Начало и источник исправного сочинения есть знание всего того, о чем можно писать. Того ради материю могут вам подать философические Сократовы книги, а речи за промышленной) материею сами потекут. Кто познал чрез учение, что он должен отечеству и что приятелям, как должно почитать родителя, как любить брата и обходиться с гостем; какая сенаторская и какая судейская должность, наконец, в чем состоит служба на войну посланного полководца, — тот поистине умеет каждую особу описать прилично и дать ей слова по ея свойству. Я притом советую искусному подражателю взирать на образ жития и нравов и оттуду получать живые речи. Иногда шуточная комедия, без всякия красоты, без важных слов и без искусного расположения, но твердого наставления и нравоучительная, больше увеселяет народ и лучшую исправлению нравов приносит пользу, нежели стихи, не имеющие вещей, и громогласные пустоши.

Грекам смысл и искусство, грекам Муза дала говорить учтиво, красно, твердо и исправно, которые ничего больше не желают, как токмо славы. Римляне от самых мягких своих ногтей долгими вычетами и счислениями учатся токмо разделять на сто частей целый асс (12 унций). Пускай спросится сын лихоимца Албина,³³¹ что буде отнять от пяти унций одну, то сколько останется? Тотчас он может сказать, что одна четверть асса. Изрядно! Нельзя ему растерять свои деньги! Но если приложить к пяти одну, то сколько всего станет? Он: «Половина асса». Сие пристрастие к богатству, сия сребролюбная ржавчина, когда уже издавна въелась в сердце, то как мы можем надеяться сочинять стихи, достойные кедров и — на соблюдение их — кипарисных ковчегов?

³³¹ Сей Албин был богатый лихоимец того времени. Знатно, что сын его был еще молод, однако ж показывал своими ответами, что он знал больше, нежели от него требовалось.

Пиитам должно или полезное, или забавное, или совокупно и то предлагать, от чего может произойти добро в жизни, и также оное, что сильно есть увеселить. Вы о чем ни имеете сочинять наставление, старайтесь быть кратким, дабы тотчас то затвердили понятные разумы и верно б в памяти содержали; ибо все излишнее вон выплывает источником. Что будете вымышлять ради увеселения, то б весьма подобно было правде, дабы не все, что баснь предлагает, принималось за самую истину, и чтоб она, из утробы насытившийся волшебницы живым младенцем, не извлекала его паки живого.

Подлинно, трудно всем угодить, ибо престарелые знатные особы презирают бесполезные поэмы, а молодые римские граждане отвращаются от важных. Того ради тот пиит удостоится токмо от всех обще похвалы, который соединяет *полезное с приятным*, услаждая читателя и совокупно преподавая ему наставление. Такая книга приносит книгопродавцам Созиа³³² много денег, такая и за море отвозится, она и знатного своего творца пересылает от века в век в бессмертной памяти. Однако находятся такие погрешения, которые мы охотно извинить желаем, ибо иногда и струна не тем отзывается голосом, коего хочет рука и ум, и требующим низкого часто посылает она высокий; также и стрела не всегда в ту цель попадает, в которую из лука ею метят. Того ради где многое блистает в стихах, там мне не досадят немногие пороки, которые или от неприлежности вкрались, или их усмотреть не могло человеческое несовершенство.

Но едва ль я не втуне сие предлагаю? Ибо как писатель книжный, ежели он многажды в том же все погрешает, хотя уж и остережен, прощения не сподобляется ни от кого, и все над музыкантом смеются, кой всегда по одной струне брячит, так я того,

³³² Созии были славные книгопродавцы того времени. Их было два брата. В те времена книгопродавцы и переплетчики не были разные люди. Кто переписывал книги, кто переплетал или, лучше, склеивал листы и столбцы, и кто продавал (*Bibliographus*, *Bibliopregus*, или *Compactor*, а, П о Цицеронову, *Glutinator* и *Bibliopola*), был токмо один человек.

который, много пишучи, мало пишет доброго, почитаю за одного Херилла, коему, дважды или трижды в некоторых местах изрядно изобразившему, с смехом удивляюсь, а потом я ж сам на него негодую. Случается иногда, что и совершенный Гомер дремлет; но в долгом сочинении невозможно, чтоб когда сон не одолел.

Какова живопись, такова поэзия; есть которая вам, близко смотрящим, понравится; есть и такая, коя полюбится далеко отстоящим. Иная любит темное место, иная желает при свете быть видима, которая не боится тонкия остроты судящих. Сия угодила токмо однажды, но другая, десятью повторенная, угодить имеет. Того ради, о! старший из юнош, хотя вас и отеческое наставление к правоте направляет, хотя ж вы и сам изрядно ведаете, однако сего следующего слова не извольте позабыть: многие есть такие науки, в которых терпеливно посредственное сносится и справедливо позволяется. Некто из приказных людей посредственный, хотя и не имеет столько искусства, сколько красноречивый Мессал, и не знает так, как Авл-Касселий, однако похвалу получает. Но посредственным быть пиитам ни боги, ни люди, ни оные в лавках столпы, к коим прибываются их поэмы, никогда не позволяют. Равно как на великолепном пировании несогласная мусикия, нечистое умащение и Сардинский горький мед с маком досаждают, для того что стол и без сих неприятностей мог отправиться, так для пользы и сладости рожденная и изобретенная поэма ежели хотя мало не достигнет до высоты, то на самый низ стремглав упадает.

Кто не обучился действовать оружием, тот в поле воином не выходит. Также: кто не умеет играть мячом, метать вверх блюдо, гонять кубарь или четырехспичное колесцо, тот за все сие и не принимается, опасаясь громкого посмеяния от многих сонмов вкруг стоящих людей. Должно и тому равный иметь страх, кто не способен к сочинению стихов, однако дерзает. А чего б ради ему не дерзать? Особливо ежели он сам господин

благородный, конному римскому дворянству положенную сумму денег Росциевым уставом имеет? и притом живет и служит беспорочно? Пускай же такой беспорочный изволяет быть порочным пиитом. Но вы ничего и не произносите и не слагайте, ежели в вас нет к тому способности; сие да будет в вас рассуждение и сие токмо мнение всегда. Ежели ж вы когда в прошедшие времена что-нибудь сочинили, то да прочтется пред искусным критиком Мецием,³³³ также пред отцом и предо мною и потом еще на девять лет да заключится в ларец.³³⁴ Когда тетради будут лежать в доме, то вольно еще вычернить, чего не издано на свет; ибо выпущенное однажды слово не может назад возвратиться. Орфей, священный и толкователь воли божеския, прежде в лесах живущих людей отвел от взаимного убийства и от мерзкия пищи, а за сие приписывают ему, что он укротил тигров и свирепых львов. Прославился и Амфион, Тебанския создатель крепости, что он в движение приводил игранием своя лиры дикие камни и сладким словом оные влек, куда ему надобно было. В древние времена в сем состояла мудрость, чтоб отличать общее от собственного, священное от мирского, чтоб запрещать скверное любодеяние и подавать правила к сожитию сочетававшимся законно, чтоб города строить и уставы вырезывать на дереве. Сим честь и славу божественные прорицатели и их стихи себе получили. После сих знаменитый Гомер и Тиртей мужественные сердца на военные действия изострил стихами. Стихами ответы давались божеския. Стихами исправляемы были нравы, и все учение состояло. Стихами приходили пииты и у царей в милость. Стихами найдены забавы и от долговременных трудов покойное отдохновение. Сие я

³³³ Сей критик, или судия, есть Спурий Меций Тарпа. Он был один из пяти учрежденных на свидетельствование сочинений. Древний некто толкователь Сатиры X Горациевы, книги I, говорит об нем следующее: *Melius Tarpa, iudex criticus, auditor assiduus poematum et poetarum, in aede Apollinis seu Musarum, quo convenire poetae solebant, suaque scripta recitare, quae nisi a Tarpa, aut alio Critico, qui numero erant quinque, probarentur, in scenam non deferebantur.* То есть: «МецийТарпа, судия критический, слушатель прилежный поэм и пиитов, в храме Аполлиновом, или Музам посвященном, куда обыкновенно пииты сходились и читали свои сочинения, кои, буде Тарпою или другим критиком, а числом их было пять человек, не подтверждаются, на театр не вносились для представления». Воссий рассуждает, что сии пять человек судей, определенных в Риме, были по подражанию Афинейским и Сицилийским пяти ж судьям, рассуждавшим о театральных сочинениях. Сей есть преславный повод к нынешним Академиям Словесным и касающимся до чистоты языка.

³³⁴ Чрез девять лет должно разуметь некоторое довольно долгое время.

для того вам предвозвещаю, чтоб вы не почитали себе в бесчестие искусных Муз лиры и певца Аполлина.

Давно уже сей вопрос предлагается, природою ль лучше производятся стихи или наукою? Что до меня, я не вижу, чтоб учение без богатыя природныя способности или бгрубая природа одна произвести могла чтонибудь совершенное. Посему одна вещь у другой взаимныя себе помощи просит, и обе соглашаются между собою дружески. Кто старается беганием до вожделенного достигнуть предела, тот в отрочестве многое понес и претерпел, потел и на холоде мерз, воздержался от венеры и от вина. Музыкант, который пиитические штуки в похвалу победителю Аполлину поет, тот прежде обучался и трепетал пред учителем. Но ныне довольно сего выговорить: «Я удивительные поэмы сочиняю». *Кто назади, тот шелудив.*³³⁵ Мне стыдно оставаться и, чему я не обучился, признаваться, что не знаю.

Как крикун, бирюча, кличет народ покупать свои товары, так пиит повелевает идти к себе ласкателям для получения подарков, ежели который богат вотчинами и много у него денег в росту ходит. Поистине кто из достаточных, который учреждает обильный стол, ручается по подлом и бедном человеке, скупает с опухлых правежей, а буде может распознать лживого с истинным другом, то сие мне всегда имеет быть из див дивом.

Что ж до вас, то вы, хотя вас дарят, хотя вы сами желаете подарить когонибудь, не извольте к стихам, сочиненным от вас, приводить ласкателя, ибо он тотчас закричит: «Хорошо, изрядно, нельзя лучше». Иногда он побледнеет при друзьях и слезы распустит, то заплашет, то ногою станет топать в землю. Равно как те приговаривают и мечутся,

³³⁵ Сия пословица точно и на нашем языке при некоторой игре от малых ребят употребляется; а говорит ее выбранная из них Матка. Вероятно, что древних римлян отроки сию ж самую игру употребляли, которая состоит в прибежании в отверстие руки Матки, коя обыкновенно у стены стоит прислонившись.

почитай, подобно всем сердцем сокрушающимся, кои нанимаются по мертвых плакать во время погребения, так насмешник всегда больше истинного хвалителя движется. Объявляют и о царях, что много чаш вина в того вливают, кого усмотреть хотят, достоин ли он будет их милости.

Ежели вы станете слагать стихи и сочиненные пред кем-нибудь читать, то смотрите, чтоб вас не обмануло чье сердце, лисьим лукавством утаенное. Буде ж бы вы что читали Квинтилию-Вару;³³⁶ то твердо знаю, что он бы вам так говорил: «Сие или то, мой друг, исправьте». Но если б вы ему представляли, что вы не можете сделать лучше и что дважды и трижды покушались без всякого успеха, однако он бы всегда чернить велел и худо сработанные стихи вновь перековать на наковальне. А когда ж бы вы ревнительнее защищать устремились ваши погрешности, нежели оные исправить, то он больше ни слова, ни суетного и тщетного не приложил бы труда, оставил бы вас без соперника любить себя и ваше сочинение.

Добрый и разумный человек неискусные стихи осудит, похулит жестокие, неукрашенные заметит черным знаком, гордые украшения отымет, темные места изъяснить принудит, двусмысленные обличит и все означит, которые должно переменить; словом, будет Аристархом,³³⁷ доказывающим в Гомере те стихи, которые не Гомеровы, и не скажет, чего б ради мне друга оскорбить в игрушке; ибо сии игрушки в бесшуточные приводят напасти однажды осмеянного и поруганного творца. Подобно как от того бегают и боятся прикоснуться, кто в неисцельной прокаже, или которого скорбь в кольцо сгибает, или кто беснуется и кого прогневанная Диана ума лишает, так

³³⁶ Квинтилиий Вар, свойственник и искренний друг Виргилию и по нем Горацию. Сей есть самый, которому Гораций приписал XVIII оду, книги I, и коего по смерти плачет он в XXIV оде.

³³⁷ Аристарх, грамматик Александрийский, родом из Самофракии, был учителем сыну Птолемея Филометора, царя египетского. Цицерон и Элиан объявляют, что его критика была толь тонкая, достоверная и рассудительная, что стих не слыл Гомеровым, ежели коего сей искусный грамматик не признал за Гомеров. Умер он в Кипре добровольным голодом, имея от рождения 72 года, не могши терпеть водяные болезни. Аристархами называют и поныне всех рассматривателей рассудительных, следующих красоте и исправности в разумных сочинениях.

рассудительные люди опасаются упрямого и тщеславного пиита и с ним не сообщаются, как с таким человеком, которого на улицах ребята дражнят и за ним гоняются.

Сей, когда, высокие стихи изрыгая, погрешает, подобно птичнику, вверх смотрящему, в колодезь или глубокую упадет яму; и хотя б сколько он ни кричал из всея силы: «Осудари, вытащите!» — однако нет ему помощника, кто и желал бы подать к нему туда вервь, но не знает, не с умысла ль он туда бросился и спастись не хочет. Пример сему явен в Сицилийском пиите Эмпедокле:³³⁸ сей, за сочинение физических поэм желая бессмертным быть богом, с безумия бросился в горящую пламенем Этну. Пускай же будет позволено погибать упрямым и самохвальным пиитам. Нехотящего кто сохраняет, то ж делает, что и убивает его, ибо тот не однажды уж хотел быть сам себе убийцею: того ради хотя и будет спасен, однако не имеет он быть человеком и не отложит охоты к славной смерти.

Наконец я не могу догадаться, чего б ради толь великая была охота к сочинению в таком пиите? Или он законопреступно осквернил отеческий гроб испущением урины на оный²⁶ и для того пришел в беснование? Или за кровосмешение, перуном пораженный, получил себе черную меланхолию? Сие токмо известно, что он неистовится и, как медведь, сорвавшийся с цепи, сей ненавистный читатель знакомого и незнакомого, искусного и незнающего разгоняет; а которого поймает, за того держится

³³⁸ Эмпедокл был великий пиит и философ, сочинил он три книги «О б естестве вещей», кои Аристотель приводит часто. Он еще описал поход Ксерксов, но дочь его или сестра сожгла все его труды по его смерти. Процветал он около L X X X Олимпиады, почитай, за 450 лет до Христова рождества. Лукреций в первой своей книге похвалит его следующим образом:

Nil tamen hoc habuisse viro praeclarius in se
Nec sanctum magis et mirum carumque videtur.
Carmina quin etiam divini pectoris eius
Vociferantur et exponunt praeclara reperta;
Ut vix humana videatur stirpe creatus.

То есть:

«Не было в Сицилии никого знаменитее, почтеннее, дивнее и любезнее сего великого философа. Божественные его стихи объявляют всем преизрядные его изобретения, и трудно верить, чтоб он рожден был смертным человеком». Впрочем, многие мнят, что то пахнет басиею, что будто он бросился в Этну, желая быть богом. Однако сие предание, самое древнее, коему Гораций следовал.

крепко и убивает чтением; такая пиявица не отвалится от тела, пока вся не напьется крови.

b. Popovsky's Translation of the AP

Увидев женский лик на шее лошадиной,
Шерсть, перья, чешую на коже вдруг единой,
Чтобы красавицей то чудо началось,
Но в черной рыбий хвост внизу оно сошлось —
Могли б ли вы тогда, Пизоны, удержаться,
Чтоб мастеру такой картины не смеяться?
Я уверяю вас, что гнусной сей урод

5

Во всем с тем слогом схож, пустых где мыслей сброд.
Как сонная мечта не вяжется нimalo,
Несходно ни с концом, ниже с собой начало, 10
Пииту, знаю я, и живописцу с ним
Возможно вымыслом представить все своим.
Сей вольности себе и от других желаем,
И сами то другим охотно позволяем;
Но ей пределы в том природою даны, 15
Чтоб с бурей не смешать любезной тишины,
Чтоб тигра не впрягать к одним саням с овцою,
И не сажать скворца в ту ж клетку со змеею.
Начавши что-нибудь великое писать,
И важности хотя стихам своим придать, 20
Мы часто в оных храм Диянин представляем,
Иль Рена быстроту и шум изображаем,
Иль радугу с дождем, иль нежные луга,
Где шумом сладкий сон наводят берега.
Но здесь о сем писать прикрасы нет ни малой, 25
Как на кафтане быть заплате цветом алой!
Пускай ты дерево так можешь начертать,
Что с подлинным отнюдь его не распознать;
Но если описать дал слово в договоре,
Как борется с волной пловец разбитый в море, 30
То дереву стоять пристанет ли при сем?
Почто начав с орла, кончаешь воробьем?

О чем кто стал писать, того уж и держися,
 И в постороннее без н^ужды не вяжися.
 О чем бы ни хотел ты петь стихи, воспой, 35
 Лишь сила слов была б одна и слог простой.
 Пиитов больша часть обманута бывает,
 Когда о доброте по виду рассуждает.
 Один за краткостью весь замысл свой темнит,
 Другой для чистоты не живо говорит, 40
 Кто любит высоту, тот пышен чрезвычайно,
 Кто просто написал, тот подл и низок крайно,
 Кто тщился красить слог свой разностью вещей,
 Дельфинов тот в лесах, в воде искал вепрей.
 Порока избежав, в другой порок впадает, 45
 Когда кто лучшего не зная, выбирает.
 Хоть порознь волосы, и жилы все в руке
 Емилий вырезать на медной знает дске,
 Однако тем его искусство все презренно,
 Что сделать целого не может совершенно, 50
 И если так, как он, желает кто успеть,
 Тот хочет быть пригож, лишь нос кривой иметь.
 Всяк должен наперед свой разум сам измерить,
 И буде может он себя удостоверить,
 Что предприятый труд его не отягчит, 55
 То стройно и красно он слог свой совершит.
 Коль хочешь написать порядочно и стройно,

То все располагай где быть чему пристойно.
 И прежде не пиши что должно назади,
 Ни заднего опять не ставь наперед, 60
 Теперь то говори, о чем прилично ныне,
 Откладывая вперед что должно в середине.
 Не меньше же и в том опасну должно быть,
 Чтоб смысла новыми словами не затмить.
 Но если свяжет их с другими так рассудно, 65
 Что силу их узнать читателю нетрудно,
 Иль нужда позовет дать новое совсем
 Название вещам незнаемым никем;
 В сих случаях от всех позволено ввести слово,
 Хоть было бы оно неслыханно и ново. 70
 Порока также нет у греков слова взять
 И, мало пременив, в число своих принять.
 Коль с Плавтом за сие у нас почтен Цецилий,
 Почто ж бы им не смел последовать Виргилий?
 И кто бы ввести одно мне слово запретил, 75
 Коль стами наш язык Катон обогатил.
 Как наши прадеды сносили терпеливно,
 Так никому и впредь не будет то противно,
 Что новую кто речь в стихах употребит,
 Которую народ давно уже твердит. 80
 Как лист на деревьях по всяку осень вянет,
 И наш недолог век, и с нами все умрут.

Увянут наконец и нивы плодородны,
 Иссхонут и моря, оставив путь безводный,
 Падут труды людей и многих пот веков, 85
 Так можно ль век стоять цене одних лишь слов?
 Иные после нас везде возобновятся,
 Что в наши времена и слышать все стыдятся,
 Иные напротив народу будут смех,
 Которые теперь в почтении у всех. 90
 Слова́ подвержены одной народной власти,
 Который, по своей располагая страсти,
 Одни приемлет в речь, другие гонит вон,
 Употребление считая за закон.
 Каким стихом писать дела особ державных, 95
 Победы и войны героев в свете славных —
 Изрядный показал нам всем тому пример
 Источник и отец поэзии Гомер.
 Елегия сперва хоть найдена к печали,
 Но ту ж и в радости потом употребляли; 100
 Кто первый вымыслил элегии писать —
 Поныне критики не могут изыскать.
 На недругов своих как Архилох озлился,
 То ямбом первый он на них вооружился,
 Потом комедиант им зрителей смешил, 105
 В трагедиях герой с любезной говорил,
 За тем, что и простой он речи весь подобен,

И слогом вáжнее, и к действиям способен.
 Но лира на себя ту должность приняла —
 Чтоб ей хвалить богов и храбрые дела, 110
 Описывать в пиру приятелей беседы,
 И сильного борца похвальные победы,
 Как конь других в бегу далеко перегнал,
 И щеголь молодой, влюбившись, воздыхал.
 Сей разности в стихах и свойств когда не знаю, 115
 Почто между пиит и место занимаю?
 И для чего хочу век лучше глупым быть,
 Как нежели учась незнание открыть?
 Комедия к стихам высоким непривычна,
 В ней только простота и шутка лишь прилична. 120
 Когда ж в трагедии представить, что Тиест
 Родных своих детей, не ведаючи, ест, —
 То низкие слова и шутки не пристали,
 И кóмический смех не вместен в сей печали.
 Вещь всякая должна свои пределы знать 125
 И никогда отнюдь чужих не занимать.
 Но и в комедии нередко слог гордится,
 Как Хрёмес на слугу, приметив ложь, ярится.
 И трагик, позабыв всю пышность с высотой,
 В печальных случаях дух опускает свой. 130
 Так Телеф и Пелей, стеснен несчастьем злостным,
 Пребедной нищетой, изгнанием поносным,

Оставят с громкостью подобной буре стих,
 Коль побудить хотят к жалению других.
 Красён быть должен стих, но сладостнее вдвое, 135
 Чтоб мог сердца склонить на то и на другое.
 Сей обще всем закон дала природа нам,
 Чтоб соответствовать всегда другим страстям;
 Коль радостен другой — и мы с ним веселимся,
 На слезы зря других — от жалости мутимся; 140
 Так прежде должен ты сам слезы испустить,
 Коль хочешь к жалости своей меня склонить.
 Когда же действие представишь мне не живо,
 То буду я, смеясь, смотреть на то лениво.
 В прискорбности имей печальны и слова; 145
 Во гневе весь пылай, и будь лютее льва;
 Шутливый вид нося, забавен будь как можно;
 А важен будучи — рассуден осторожно.
 Чтоб прежде внутренни премены были в нас
 Согласны с внешними — велит природы глас. 150
 Чтоб в радости иметь лицо и мысль спокойну,
 В беде потупленны глаза и скорбь пристойну,
 Потом тоску свою словами изъяслять
 И тяжесть горести с другими разделять.
 Когда признают слог с персоною несходным, 155
 То будет он смешон простым и благородным.
 И для того смотри — слуга иль господин,

Старик иль молодой представлен дворянин,
 Честная женщина, или раба презренна;
 Купцова речь должна быть от селян отменна. 160
 Отечества притом персоны рассуждай
 И всякому свое народу свойство дай.
 Быль точно так пиши, как говорят в народе,
 А вымысл чтоб во всем отвечивал природе.
 Намерен описать мне Ахиллесов жар — 165
 Представь, что он свиреп, несклонен, грозен, яр,
 Не хочет подлежать закону никакому,
 Все право отдает войнскому лишь грому.
 Медея будь в любви и в гневе жестока,
 Иона — горестна, Инона — всем жалка. 170
 Иксион в вымыслах и дружестве коварен,
 Орест к родителям своим неблагодарен.
 Но если новое что хочешь описать,
 Иль небывалую персону представлять —
 Смотри, чтоб, каковы ей нравы дать сначала, 175
 И до конца она тех не переменяла.
 Весьма тяжелый труд — так новый скрасить слог,
 Чтоб в оном получить верх похвалы, кто мог.
 Скорей трагедию из старой и готовой
 Материи сложить, как нежели из новой. 180
 Хотя другому в чем ты будешь подражать,
 Однако за твое всяк станет почитать.

Когда во всем его не будешь ты держаться,
 И чтоб ни на пядень не отступить, стараться —
 Но вольность в разуме своем употребишь, 185
 Одно отбросишь прочь, другое — отменишь.
 И, следуя за ним его стезями точно,
 Не зãйдешь в тесноту такую не нарочно,
 Чтоб отступить назад иль стыд не попускал,
 Или всех общих дел закон не позволял. 190
 Не следуй легкого писателя примеру,
 По рынку что бродя, хвалился через меру:
 «Брань страшну опишу, героев горьку часть,
 Паденье сильных войск, Приамову напасть».
 Всяк думал про него, что тщился красотою 195
 Оставить всех творцов далеко за собою;
 Но он, как дряхлый конь, версты не пробежал,
 Уж бегом утомлен, затрясся и упал.
 Счастливее Гомер, что в простоте пристойной
 Великий начал труд и похвалы достойный: 200
 «Скажи, о муза, мне о славном муже том,
 Что, в пепел обратив Приамов гордый дом,
 Изведал на пути народов нравы многих,
 Повсюду странствуя Небес веленьем строгих».
 Не тьмою хочет свет, но светом тьму скончать, 205
 И большие дела в середине описать;
 Коль страшен Антифат, и Сцилла в бездне скрыта,

Ужасен Полифем, Харибда коль несыта,
Начало повести не издали ведет,
Но к делу самому поспешно он течет 210
И к знанию конца охоту возбуждает;
Когда ж не чаёт в том успеха — оставляет.
Так вяжет вымыслы, мешает с правдой ложь,
С началом чтоб конец был и с серединой схож.
Теперь я объявлю то, что мне и угодно, 215
И купно все со мной похвалят всенародно.
Коль хочешь, чтоб тобой доволен зритель был
И, не дождав конца, домой не уходил,
То возраст, и лета, и качества различны
Во всяком примечай, и нравы дай приличны. 220
Младенец, что ходить удобно может сам
И твердо говорить — охотник будь к играм,
Сердит из ничего, но тотчас вдруг беззлобен,
Непостоянному Зефиру тем подобен.
Когда же дядькина гроза со всем минет, 225
И молодеческих уже достигнет лет —
Охотник до коней, гоняться с псами в поле
За дикими зверьми, и по своей жить воле.
О пользе нерадив, к порокам склонен, тверд,
И к увещателям своим жестокосерд, 230
Роскошен, прихотлив, вещей высоких чаёт,
Чего сперва желал — то после презирает.

Кто в мужество пришел и разумом стал здоров —
 Иные склонности, иной имеет нрав;
 Снискать богатство, честь и дружество надежно 235
 Печется, чтоб прожить мог век свой безмятежно,
 Не хочет ничего такого учинить,
 О чем бы после мог, раскаявшись, тужить.
 Но старость большее наводит беспокойство —
 Богатство собирать, верховное в ней свойство. 240
 И ночь, и день старик все думает про то,
 Чтобы не издержать полушки ни на что,
 Слаб в деле и нескор, пожить еще желает,
 Хотя уж смотрит в гроб, но на век запасает.
 Откладывает все вперед и всех журит, 245
 И что ни сделаешь — «Не так», — он говорит.
 Прошедши хвалит дни, вспоминая детство,
 А настоящее считает все за бедство.
 Щуняет молодых, не хвалит никого,
 И хочет, чтобы всяк все делал по его. 250
 По тех пор свет нам мил, пока еще мы в силе;
 Постыло будет все, чем ближе мы к могиле!
 По-детски старика играть не заставляй,
 И юношеских свойств мужам не придавай.
 В пристойных званиях всяк должен обращаться, 255
 И, смóтря по летам, в чужие не вступаться.
 Иное явно всем обычай представлять,

Иное ж краткими словами объявлять.
 Хоть меньше чувствуем, что сделалось заочно,
 Как то, что сами мы глазами видим точно; 260
 Но если действия такой случится род,
 От коего глаза весь отвратил народ, —
 То лучше не казать позорища такого,
 Сказав, что в тай сбылось, не повторяя слова.
 Когда Медею я в крови своих детей 265
 Увижу, либо что в котле варит Атрей
 Племянников своих младенческие члены,
 Иль Кадма с Прогною плачевные премены,
 Что Прогна в птицу, Кадм в скорпию превращен,
 Не веря буду я от ужаса смущен. 270
 Пять действий содержать слог должен непременно,
 Чтоб все в нем случаи представить совершенно.
 Богов не представляй без нүжды никаких,
 Коль можно разорвать все трудности без них.
 Три дόжны говорить персоны меж собою, 275
 Коль есть четвертая, то будь при них немою;
 Хор только весь одну персону представляй,
 И ничего среди явлений не мешай,
 Что б было действию прошедшему противно,
 Но связь веи во всем к концу непрерывно; 280
 Всезнание его в том состоит одном —
 Желать тому добра, нет гордой злобы в ком;

Дружьям давать совет, смягчить гнев раздраженных,
 И крепко защищать невинно огорченных.
 Воздержность похвалять, закон и правоту, 285
 И мир вселенная едину красоту,
 И тайны сохранять, молить богов всемогущих,
 Чтоб гордых свергнули, возвысив непорочных.
 Свирель сперва не так, как в наши времена
 Похожа на трубу и медью скреплена, 290
 Но тонкая была, из малых состояла
 Нарочных дырочек, чтоб хору припевала.
 Хотя было зрителей немного там числом,
 Но правду все блюли в незлобии святом;
 Когда ж народ свои простер победы дале, 295
 И град распространил, что тесен был вначале,
 Спокойствием пользуясь, стал в роскоши впадать,
 И праздничные дни в пирах препровождать —
 С тех пор и бóльшая краса в стихи вступила,
 И прежний грубый звук музыка отменила. 300
 Незнающий народ и праздный от труда
 Не мог не похвалить сей вольности тогда,
 Взирая, что сие судьям, дворянам знатным
 Достойным зрения казалось и приятным.
 Тогда и музыкант, что только знал играть, 305
 В богатом платье стал под флейтой танцевать;
 И умноженьем струн звук арфы увеличен,

И смысла быстротой введен слог необычен,
 Что предсказанием и пользой важных дел
 С ответом божеским подобие имел. 310
 Трагедию творец публично представляя,
 Нимало важности ее не умаляя,
 Шутливым Сáтиром меж действий выбегал,
 И важность прежнюю с забавою мешал,
 Чтоб по отдании богам хвалы, довольный, 315
 Упившейся вином народ и своевольный
 Приятной новостью еще увеселить
 И за труды козла в награду получить.
 Я Сáтиру шутить охотно позволяю;
 Лишь только в том ему пределы полагаю, 320
 Чтоб, если в прежних он был действиях герой,
 Иль божий вид носил в порфире золотой,
 Не сбился наконец на подлый слог и гнусный,
 Которым говорит сапожник неискусный;
 Иль, низких бегая и всенародных слов, 325
 Не взнесся пышностью пустой до облаков.
 Как пляшет в праздничны дни женщина честная,
 Ни важности своей, ни чести не теряя,
 Так между Сáтиров трагедия должна
 Учтива быть в словах, приятна и важна. 330
 Когда же в сáтирах хотел я обращаться,
 То подлых стал бы слов и гнусных опасаться,

Ниже от трагика так был бы отменит,
Чтобъ не рассуждать о том, кто говорит?
Служанка подлая, иль раб, под видом верный, 335
Что ввел в долги господ услугой лицемерной?
Иль важное лицо, каков был тот Силен,
Которым Бахус сам из детства научен.
Знакомую всем вещь так вымыслом устрою,
Что будут рассуждать другие меж собою — 340
Мы сами равного могли б успеха ждать,
Когда бы время в том хотели потерять;
Но делом испытав, всяк много б пролил пота,
И тщетно б наконец пропала вся работа.
Толь много от того зависит слога честь, 345
Чтоб ведать, как в честной порядок речь привести!
В лесу рожденный фавн и взросший меж горами
Не должен нежиться так мягкими словами,
Как будто бы он был воспитан меж людьми;
Но напротив того и острыми речью 350
Не наносить другим бесчестья и досады,
Не может за сие ждать лучшей он награды,
Как только зрителей лишь к гневу побудить,
Хвалы ни от кого за то не получить.
Стопа, что ямб слывет, два слога заключает; 355
Начавшись с краткого, протяжным бег кончает.
Для скорого в стопах течения сей стих

Тримерным стали звать, хоть шесть в нем ровно их,
 Которые сперва все одинаки были,
 Но после и спондей меж них творцы вместили, 360
 Чтоб он протяжностью своею всякий слог
 Тем лучше важнейшим представить слуху мог;
 Вторая лишь стопа с четвертой презирают,
 И места своего ему не уступают.
 Хоть Антия всего и Енния прочтешь, 365
 Спондеев в сих местах немного ты найдешь.
 Метаться с ямбами в трагедиях спондею,
 Как хочет кто другой, позволить я не смею;
 Всяк будет мнить, что ты иль тщаться не хотел,
 Иль наскоро слагал, иль лучше не умел 370
 Неправильность в стихах не всякий видит ясно,
 И многие из них похвалены напрасно;
 Но должен ли же я всегда в надежде той
 Писать как хочется, по воле все слепой?
 Нет, должно рассуждать, что будут все пороки 375
 Усмотрены во мне и примут суд жестокий.
 И, хоть бы знал, что мне простят мою вину,
 Однак не допускать, чтоб быть обличену.
 Но и сие хотя я наблюдал бы строго,
 Хулы б лишь избежал — хвалы снискал немного. 380
 Вы греческих пиит читайте всякий час,
 Коль с Пиндаром взлететь хотите на Парнас.

Что наши прадеды хвалили в Плавте шутки,
И слушали его стихи чрез целы сутки —
Я не отважусь в том их глупыми назвать, 385
Но меньше должно бы им Плавту в том ласкать,
Как если сам себе я в том поверить смею,
Что шутку распознать от грубости умею,
И чувствовать могу, или по пальцам счесть,
Где лишняя стопа в стихе, где ровно шесть. 390
Коль можно верить в том другим — изобретатель
Трагедий Теспис был, и пёрвейший писатель;
Который и сие обыкновенье ввел,
Чтоб езда игроки на роспусках вокруг сел,
И вымарав лицо в дрожжах, стихи читали, 395
И людям действия различны представляли.
Но Ешил наконец театр постановил,
И маскою лицо от зрителей закрыл,
В одежду долгую и сапоги высоки
Убравшись, в разговор ввел замыслы глубоки. 400
Потом комедия старинна найдена,
И многой похвалой сперва ободрена;
Но вольность укоризн несносной стала многим,
И выдан был указ под запрещеньем строгим;
С тех пор в комедиях хор вечно замолчал
И больше зрителям уже не досаждал.
Пииты римские о всем почти писали,

И много в том себе почтения снискали,
Которы греческих оставив следы дел,
Осмелились писать, как город Рим процвел, 410
Ил_ и_ дела особ великих по природе,
Иль то, что лишь в простом приметили народе.
И много б сла́внее по всей вселенной Рим
Был слога красотой, как мужеством своим,
Когда бы скучная поправка не мешала, 415
И медленность труда пиит не отвращала.
Лишен хвалы тот стих, что с потом и трудом
Не выправлен сто раз притупленным пером.
Демóкрит правило и труд зовет бесплодным,
Когда не одарен кто разумом природным, 420
И что как восхищен восторгом должен быть,
Кто к стихотворчеству желает приступить.
Для сих причин из нас иной пренебрегает
Всю внешню чистоту, ногтей не обстригает,
Не бреет бороды, дичится от людей, 425
И бань не знает век, в грязи — хоть до ушей;
Он будто прослывет пиитою великим,
Что, зверем сделавшись из человека диким,
Густую бороду до самых пустит пят,
Сам будучи козла глупее в десять крат. 430
О, как я своего сам счастья не знаю —
Что желчь по всякий год лекарством выгоняю,

Через которую в безумье я бы впал,
 И тем бы лучше всех стихи свои слагал.
 Но коль достоин я был всякого бы смеха, 435
 Когда б в одних стихах желая лишь успеха,
 Нарочно для того хотел с ума сойти
 И самовольно жизнь в опасность привести?
 Коль правда то, то пусть я брусу в том подобен,
 Железо что острит, сам резать не способен; 440
 И ничего хотя писать не буду сам,
 Но правила другим полезные предам,
 И те способности и средства открою,
 Как знание снискать в поэзии с хвалою,
 Что кстати в ней, что нет; коль нужно наблюдать, 445
 Чтоб правила хранить, пороков убегать.
 Чтоб основательно кто мог писать и право,
 Тот должен рассуждать о всякой вещи здраво.
 Материю о всем у Сократа найдешь,
 К материи слова нетрудно приберешь. 450
 Кто знает должности сродством к соединенным,
 К отечеству, к друзьям, к пришельцам отдаленным,
 И звание вождя, министра и судьи —
 Тот нравы всякому умеет дать свои.
 Смотря на житие и нравы всех различны, 455
 Пиита, вымышляй слова к тому приличны;
 Случалось и сие, я помню, много раз,

Что слог без замыслов, простой и без прикрас,
Но только общими размноженный местами,
И нравы точными изобразив словами, 460
Мог больше усладить всего народа ум,
Пустая как краса и тщетный только ум.
Одной желающим лишь только грекам славы
И красный муза слог дала, и разум здравый.
Но римски юноши над тем сидят одним, 465
Из грóша по чему дать должно пятерым.
И если кто из них ответ даст сей загадке,
Что вычести из двух одну — одна в остатке,
Или что будет пять, коль три с двумя сложить —
Всяк скажет — есть в нем путь, умеет домом жить. 470
Но буде ржа сия однажды в нас вселиться,
И в мысли лакомство несыто вкоренится,
То можно ль нам того успеха ожидать,
Чтоб вечности стихи достойные слагать?
Пииты научить иль усладить желают, 475
Иль вместе все сие они соединяют.
Но должно правила корóтко предлагать,
Чтоб доле помнить их и лучше перенять.
Речь плодовитая тот вред умам наводит,
Что мало походя из памяти выходит; 480
Забавный вымысел будь с истиною схож —
Не жди, чтоб всякую почли за правду ложь.

Чтоб отрок съеденный был вынут жив из чрева —
Какой дурак тебе поверит в том без гнева?
Полезный слог одним угоден старикам — 485
Младые склоннее к забавным лишь стихам;
Но обще будет всем сие в пиите нравно,
Когда напишет он полезно и забавно;
Такой слог за море с прибытком продавцу
Развозят и чинят честь вечную творцу. 490
Хотя ж погрешность в нем какая и случится,
Однако может он нетрудно извиниться.
Коль часто музыкант, прошибшись, зазвенел
Не в ту, в которую струну сперва хотел,
И вместо тонкого с густого начал звука, 495
Охотник не всегда уметил в цель из лука.
Когда я большу часть в ком доброго сыщу,
Охотно малые погрешности прощу,
Которы написал или неосторожно,
Иль было избежать того отнюдь не можно. 500
Но если усмотрю пороков больше в нем,
То будет Хэрилу подобен он совсем —
В котором места два за стройность похваляю,
За третье гневаюсь, смеюсь и осуждаю.
Писец, что десять раз за опись осужден, 505
Коль в том же погрешит — прощенья стал лишен;
И смеха музыкант считается достойным,

Что звуком всякому наскучил уж нестройным.
Хоть, правда, и Гомер сам дремлет иногда,
Но в нем простительно для долгого труда. 510
Стихи — как живопись; одна вблизи красива,
Другая издали достойно мнится дива.
Одна лишь темноту, другая любит свет,
Котора похвалы себе на смотре ждет,
Одна из них сперва понравится однажды, 515
Другую предпочтет, когда ни взглянет, каждый.
Тебе я говорю, который старшинством
Меж братьями почтен, искусством и умом.
Хоть ты и от отца учен, и сам собою
В поэзии успел с немалою хвалою; 520
Однак за лишнее того не почитай,
Что я тебе скажу, но помни и внимай —
В известных случаях посредственность лишь сносна,
В других, против того, бесчестна и поносна.
Хоть стряпчий говорит не так красно в суде, 525
Как Мёссал, что за слог толь славится везде;
Хотя юрисконсульт указов меньше знает,
Как сколько наизусть Касселий прочитает —
Однако ж хвалят их обоих и за то,
И совершенства в них не требует никто. 530
Пиита, напротив, не может быть почтенным,
Когда со всех сторон не будет совершенным.

Меж сладких кушаньев отбрасывает всяк
Неблаговонну масть, и с горьким медом мак;
Гнушается, сердясь, нестройною музыкой, 535
За тем, что не было там нужды в том великой.
Так и пиитин слог, рожденный для того,
Чтоб мысли услаждать приятностью его,
Хоть мало не дойдет, чтоб первым почитаться,
То будет принужден в последних он остаться. 540
Коль упражнений кто не знает полевых,
Тот не примается в посмех другим за них;
Кто кубарем, мячом, кружком играть не знает,
Тот в оные отнюдь забавы не вступает,
Чтоб за дурачество народ не осмеял, 545
Что тем, не знаячи, похвастовать желал.
Один писать стихи никто лишь не стыдился,
Хотя б поэзии он сроду не учился.
Резон? Я дворянин, свободный человек,
Богат с излишеством, и честно прожил век. 550
Но ты, что одарен рассудком благородным,
Не сисься вопреки способностям природным!
Изведать хочешь сил своих в стихах — сложи,
Но прежде Метию иль мне их покажи,
И долго не давай в народе их расславить, 555
Чтоб можно было тем свободнее исправить.
А если как-нибудь их выпустишь на свет,

То поздно вскаешься — словам возврата нет.
 Стихами отвратил народ от зверства дикий
 И страшных меж собой убийств Орфей великий. 560
 И от сего прошла баснь, будто усмирил
 Он неприступных львов и тигров укротил;
 И будто Амфион, что Фебы град построил,
 Как нежным голосом приятность струн удвоил,
 Мягчил и приводил в движенье гор сердца, 565
 И вел куда хотел, послушных, до конца.
 Так древность грубую и дикую сначала
 Пиит отменная премудрость научала,
 Как собственную вещь от общей разделить,
 Священну от мирской почтеньем отменить, 570
 Указом запретить смешенье беззаконно,
 Невежество, козлу что прежде было склонно,
 Законом обуздать, построить города,
 Супругов удержать в союзе от блудá,
 Сия была тому причина, несомненно, 575
 Что имя сделалось пиит у всех почтенно.
 Потом настал Гомер и славный тот Тиртей,
 Стихами что разжег на брань сердца мужей.
 Стихами и судьбу опосле провещая,
 И правила как жить другим преподавая, 580
 Стихами милости искали у других,
 И игры найдены, чтоб был трудам отдых.

Сие я для того чиню тебе известно,
 Чтоб не почел ты быть пиитою бесчестно.
 Природе ль должен дар пиита приписать, 585
 Иль можно всякому трудом его сыскать,
 Давно уж идет спор — я мню, что и природна
 Способность без труда и склонность вся бесплодна.
 Когда природа с ней не соединена,
 Не может без другой особь стоять одна. 590
 Кто хочет побеждать в бегу других с хвалою,
 Тот сласти попирал в младенчестве ногою,
 Из детска привыкал к морозу и жарам
 И тело предавал несноснейшим трудам.
 Кто в честь Аппóлона играет в флейту нежно — 595
 Учился прежде тот у мастера прилежно.
 Здесь я скончаю речь. Себя всяк хвалит сам;
 Натура родила меня к одним стихам;
 Кто хуже всех из нас стихи свои слагает,
 За глупость тот пускай с коросты пропадает. 600
 Я перед прочими последним быть стыжусь,
 Не смыслю ничего — однак не признаюсь.
 Как вестник кличет всех, чтоб распродать товары,
 Богатый так льстецам сулит пиита дáры;
 Но может ли льстеца от друга распознать, 605
 Кто силен на суде другого защищать,
 За скудного в долгах великих поручиться,

Держать богатый стол и с знатными водиться.
Но ты хоть от других подарок получишь,
Или сам что-нибудь другому посулишь — 610
То не кажи стихов своих надежде жадной,
И ведай наперед, что скажет, ах, изрядно —
Он, с дива изумлен, явится как немой,
Заплачет с радости, ударит в пол ногой.
Как те, что нанялись до самая могилы 615
По мертвом из всей рыдать и рваться силы,
Гораздо с большею надсадою кричат,
Как нежель мать его, сестра, отец и брат.
Так и насмешники все больше похваляют,
Как кои искренно изрядным называют. 620
Я слышал, что цари нарочно тех поят
Допьяна, дружества изведать в ком хотят.
Примером научен, и сам ты опасайся —
Хвалителям стихов в посмех не отдавайся.
Квинтилий, если что читали перед ним, 625
«Вот то и то поправь», — говаривал он им;
И буде скажет кто: «Я десять раз примался,
Но лучше не возмог, и труд мой так остался» —
Тогда советовал то вовсе замарать,
Иль переделать вновь, иное выправлять. 630
Когда ж заспорит кто, что нет нигде худого, —
Нет нүжды никакой переправлять их снова;

В покое оставлял, не тратя слов своих,
Льстить самому себе без зависти других.
Разумный человек стихов худых не сносит; 635
Где грубо — объявит, худое — прочь отбросит,
Прикрасы лишние прикажет он отнять,
И темные места яснее написать;
заметив те слова, где можно усомниться,
где должно выправить — сказать не поленится. 640
И будет Аристарх, не скажет, умолчу —
Я друга в мелочи озлобить не хочу.
А будто мелочь то, чтоб похвалой притворной
В стыд после привести и смех у всех позорный!
Всяк, в ком есть здравый смысл, тот от худых пиит, 645
Еще за десять верст увидевши, бежит —
Так, как от бешеных, или от прокаженных,
Или опасною болезнью зараженных.
Одни лишь отроки, не мысля, что́ есть вред,
По стогнам гонятся за ними грудой вслед. 650
Такой стихов творец вверх упершись глазами,
И смеха полными рыгаючи стихами,
Когда, как птицелов, что птиц следы блюдет,
Засмотрится, и сам в колодец упадет;
Никто не сжалится, чтоб вытащить из пасти, 655
Осипнет хоть крича: «Спасите от напасти!»
Когда ж бы кто-нибудь, услышав жалкий стон,

Канат к нему хотел спустить и вынуть вон,
То б я его спросил: «Но знаешь ли ты точно,
Что он без умысла упал и не нарочно?» 660
Потом бы объявил Емпéдоклов конец,
Который был стихов в Сицилии творец;
Желая меж людьми прослыть бессмертным богом,
Сам в Етну волею скочил в безумье многом.
Так не мешай ему, коль хочет, пропадать; 665
Неволею спасти есть то ж, что убивать.
Он случая искал такого многократно,
Хотя бы кто его и вынял вон обратно,
То человеком он не будет уж опять,
Но станет сызнова погибели искать. 670
Неведомо за что толь тяжко он страдает,
Что о стихах и днем, и ночью помышляет;
Отеческий ли гроб и пепел осквернил,
Иль, будучи нечист, по тем местам ходил,
Что были громовым поражены ударом, 675
И к коим молния своим коснулась жаром.
Известно только то, что, как свирепый зверь,
Который выломил запоры вон и дверь,
Так страшен для стихов и он людскому взору;
И задних, и встречных всех гонит без разбора; 680
Но если где кого, догнавши, улучит,
Читая, целый день несчастного морит,

И мучит до того в бездельном самом деле,
Пока от скуки в нем чуть дух останет в теле.

VI. References

Primary sources

Aristóteles, Horácio, Longino. A Poética Clássica. Tradução direta do grego e do latim por Jaime Bruna. Cultrix. São Paulo. 1981.

Boileau, N. *Ouvres Complètes. Introduction par Antoine Adam. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade. Gallimard. 1966.*

Bogdanóvitch, I.F. *Stikhotvoriênia i Poemy. Soviétski Pisátel: Leningrad, 1957.*

Carmina Anacreontea. Edidit West, M. L. Stutgardiae: B. G. Teubner, 1993.

Derjávín, G. R. *Sotchiniênia Derjávina v 9 tomakh. Pod Redáktsiei Ia. Grot. Imperatorskaia Akadîemii Nauk. SPb. 1864-1883.*

_____. *Deiâtelnosti i Perepiska. Izvletchenó iz pôdlinnykh bumag Ia. Grotom Spb. 1861.*

Q. Horatius Flaccus *Opera (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. ed. Shackleton Bailey). De Gruyter. Berlin, New York, 2008*

Horace. *Odes and Epodes. Edited and translated by Rudd, N. Loeb Classical Library. Vol. 33. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2004.*

_____. *Satires, Epistles, Ars Poetica. Edited and translated by Fairclough, H.R. Loeb Classical Library. Vol. 194. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005.*

Oeuvres d'Horace (*traduites par M. Dacier et le P. Sanadon avec les remarques critiques, historiques et géographiques – 8 vols.*). Amsterdam, 1735.

Kantemir A. D. *Sotchiniênia, Písma i Ízbrannye Perevody. Vol. I & II (Rússkie Pisáteli XVIII i XIX st.) Ob. Red. P. A. Efriêmova. SPb, 1867.*

Kapnist, V.V. *Ízbrannye Proizvediênia. Leningrad, 1973.*

Kheraskov, M.M. *Ízbrannye Proizvediênia. Soviétski Pisátel: Leningrad, 1961.*

Kniajnín, *Ízbrannye Proizvediênia. Soviétski Pisátel: Leningrad, 1961.*

Lomonóssov, M. V. *Pôlnoe Sobránie Sotchiniênie (PSS) Tom 1 – 10. Izdátelstvo Akadiêmii Naúk SSSR. Moskvá, Leningrad. 1955.*

Nôvikov, N. I. *Ízbrannye Proizvediênia pod Redáktsiei G. P. Makogonenko. Izdátelstvo Khudôjestviennaia Literatura. 1951.*

Pindar. *Olympian and Pythian Odes. Edited and translated by Race W.S. Loeb Classical Library. Vol. 485. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2006.*

_____. *Nemean and Isthmian Odes. Edited and translated by Race W.S. Loeb Classical Library. Vol. 485. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2006.*

Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis. ed. C.M. Bowra. Oxford UP, 1980.

Pontanus, J, S.J. *Poeticarum Institutionum L.III Ed. Tertia cum Auctario & Indice Hactenus Desiderato. Ingolstad, 1600.*

Prokopóvitch, F. *Sotchiniênia. Izdtvo. A.N. SSSR: Moskvá, Leningrad, 1961.*

Púchkin, A. S. *Pôlnoe Sobránie Sotchinienie na 10 Tomov. Akadiemii Nauk SSSR. Leningrad. 1950.*

Ronsard, P. *Oeuvres Complètes. Publiée par M. Prosper Blanchemain. Tome I. Paris, 1957.*

Sumarôkov, A. P. *Pôlnoe Sobránie Proizvedeniia. Tom 1-10. Moskvá, 1787.*

Trediakóvski, V. K. *Soctchiniênia i Perevódy kak Stikhami, tak i Prózu. ed. N. IU. Alekseeva et Stepánov, V.P. Sankt-Peterburg: Naúka, 2009.*

_____. *Ízbrannye Proizvediênia. Soviétski Pisátel: Leningrad, 1963.*

Published studies:

Adam, Antoine. *Histoire de la littérature française au XVIIe siècle*. Vol. 1. Bibliothèque de l'évolution de l'humanité 24–26. Paris: A. Michel, 1997.

_____. *Histoire de la littérature française au XVIIe siècle*. Vol. 2. Bibliothèque de l'évolution de l'humanité 24–26. Paris: A. Michel, 1997.

Alekseeva, N.Iu. "Literaturnaya polemika srediny XVIII veka o perevode stikhov". *XVIII Vek* 24 (2006): 15–34.

_____. "Primechaniia Antiokha Kantemira k 'Pis'mam Goratsiia'". *XVIII Vek* 27 (2013): 5–26.

_____. *Russkaya Oda: Razvitiie Odicheskoy formy v VII-VIII vekakh*. St. Peterburg: Nauka, 2005.

Baehr, Stephen L. "From History to National Myth: Translatio Imperii in Eighteenth-Century Russia". *The Russian Review* 37, n° 1 (1978): 1–13.

Benjamin, Walter, Marcus Paul Bullock, Michael William Jennings, Howard Eiland, e Gary Smith. *Selected Writings*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press, 1996.

Berkov, Pavel N. *Istoriia Russkoi Literatury XVIII Veka: Bibliografichesky Ukazatel'*.

Moskva Leningrad: Izdatelstvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1968.

_____. *Istoriia Russkoi Zhurnalistiki XVIII Beka*. Moskva, Leningrad: Izdatelstvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1952.

———. *Lomonosov i literaturnaya polemika ego vremeni*. Moskva: Izdatelstvo Akademii Nauk, 1936.

———. “Rannye Russkie Perevodchiki Goratsiia (k 2000-letiiu so dnia rozhdeniia Goratsiia)”. *Izvestiia Akademii Nauk SSSR* 10 (1935): 1039–56.

Boileau. *Oeuvres Complètes*. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade. Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 1966.

Brink, Charles O. *Horace on Poetry: Epistles Book II*. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

———. *Horace on Poetry: Prolegomena to the Literary Epistles*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

———. *Horace on Poetry: the Ars Poetica*. Vol. 2. Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Bucsele, J. “The Problems of Baroque in Russian Literature”. *The Russian Review* 31, n° 3 (1972): 260–71.

Busch, Wolfgang. *Horaz in Russland: Studien und Materialien*. Vol. 2. Forum Slavicum. München: Eidos Verlag, 1964.

Chrissidis, Nikolaos A. *An academy at the court of the tsars: Greek scholars and Jesuit education in early modern Russia*. First edition. DeKalb, IL: NIU Press, 2016.

Cracraft, James. *The Petrine revolution in Russian culture*. Cambridge, Mass: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2004.

———. *The Petrine revolution in Russian imagery*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Davis, Gregson, org. *A companion to Horace*. Blackwell companions to the ancient world. Chichester, West Sussex, United Kingdom ; Malden, MA, USA: Blackwell, 2010.

De Madariaga, Isabel. *Politics and Culture in Eighteenth-Century Russia: Collected Essays*. 1. publ. London: Longman, 1998.

- Drage, C. L. “The ‘Anacreontea’ and 18th-Century Russian Poetry”. *The Slavonic and East European Review* 41, nº 96 (1962): 110–34.
- . “The Introduction of Russian Syllabo-Tonic Prosody”. *The Slavonic and East European Review* 54, nº 4 (1976): 481–503.
- Evans, R. J. Morda. “Antiokh Kantemir and His First Biographer and Translator”. *The Slavonic and East European Review* 37, nº 88 (1958): 184–95.
- Farell SJ (Editor), A.P. *The Jesuit Ratio Studiorum of 1599*. Washington D.C.: Conference of Major Superiors of Jesuits, [s.d.].
- Fedelli, Paolo. *Le Epistole L’Arte Poetica*. Vol. II. Quinto Orazio Flacco: Le Opere. Roma: Instituto Poligrafico e Zecca Dello Stato, 1997.
- Fiodorov, A.S., e G.E. Pavlova. *Mijaíl Vasílevich Lomonosov. Vida y Obra*. Moscú: Editorial Mir, 1987.
- Fraenkel, Eduard. *Horace*. Oxford : New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Frate, Rafael. “Ensaio sobre a vida póstuma”. *Phaos* 17, nº 1 (2017): 35–67.
- . “Mikhail Vassílievich Lomonóssov: uma apresentação”. Dissertação de mestrado, Universidade de São Paulo, 2016.
- Gasparov, M L. *Oчерк истории русского стиха*. Moskva: Fortuna Limited, 2000.
- Gasparov, M. L., Gerald Stanton Smith, e Leofranc Holford-Strevens. *A History of European Versification*. Oxford : Oxford ; New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Geldern, James von. “The Ode as a Performative Genre”. *Slavic Review* 50, nº 4 (1991): 927–39.
- Hansen, J. A. Barroco, neobarroco e outras ruínas. *Teresa*, (2) (2001): 10-67.
- . *A sátira e o engenho: Gregório de Matos e a Bahia do século XVII*. 2. rev. ed. São Paulo: Ateliê Ed, 2004.

- Hardison, O. B. "Blank Verse before Milton". *Studies in Philology* 81, n° 3 (1984): 253–74.
- Harrison, S. J., org. *The Cambridge companion to Horace*. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Horace, e Henry Rushton Fairclough. *Satires Epistles and Ars Poetica*. Loeb Classical Library 194. Cambridge (Mass.) London: Harvard university press, 1991.
- Horace, e Niall Rudd. *Odes and Epodes*. Loeb Classical Library 33. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana. *Orazio: enciclopedia oraziana*. 3 vols. Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana, 1996.
- Kahn, Andrew. *Pushkin's lyric intelligence*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- . "Readings of Imperial Rome from Lomonosov to Pushkin". *Slavic Review* 52, n° 4 (1993): 745–68.
- Katzprchak, E.I., e et alii. *Svodny Katalog Russkoi Knigi Grazhdanskoi Pechati XVIII Veka*. 6 vols. Moskva: Izdaniie Gosudarstvennoi Biblioteki SSSR Imeni V.I. Lenina, 1976.
- Kibalnik, S.A. "O Ritorike Feofana Prokopovicha". *XVIII Vek* 14 (1983): 193–206.
- Kochanowski, Jan, Seamus Heaney, e Jan Kochanowski. *Laments*. Poetry. London: Faber and Faber, 1995.
- Kochetkova, N. D., et alii, e Institut ruskoï literatury (Pushkinskiĭ dom), orgs. *Slovar' russkikh pisatelei XVIII veka*. Leningrad: "Nauka," Leningradskoe otd-nie, 1988.
- Liburkin, D.L. *Ruskaia Novolatiskaya Poeziia: Materialy k Istorii XVII-Pervaya polovina XVIII veka*. Moskva: Rossiisky Gosudarstvenny Gumanitarny Universitet, 2000.
- Macleod, Colin. *Horace, The Epistles: Translated into English with a brief commentary*. Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1986.

- Marker, Gary. *Publishing, printing, and the origins of intellectual life in Russia, 1700-1800*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1985.
- Massie, Robert K. *Peter the Great: his life and world*. 2012 Modern Library edition. New York: Modern Library, 2012.
- Pait, Maya Iakovlevna. “Problemy retseptsii od i epodov Goratsiia v Rossii XVIII- nachala XIX vv.” Master’s Dissertation, University of Moscow, 2004.
- Pekarski, P. *Istoriia Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk*. 2 vols. S. Peterburg: Tipografiia Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk, 1870.
- Petrov, N.I. *Kievskaya Akademiia vo Vtoroy Polovine XVII v*. Kiev: Tipografiia G.T. Kortchak Novitskogo, 1895.
- Prokopovich, Feofan. *Ob iskusstve ritoricheskoy desyat' knig*. Traduzido por G. A. Stratanovskii. Moskva Sankt-Peterburg: Al’jans-Archeo, 2020.
- Radovsky, M.I. *Antioch Kantemir i Peterburgskaya Akademiia Nauk*. Moskva, Leningrad: Izdatelstvo Akademii Nauk, 1959.
- Reyffman, Irina. *Vasilii Trediakovsky: the fool of the “new” Russian literature*. Studies of the Harriman Institute, Columbia University. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 1990.
- Ringler, W. *Poeta Nascitur non Fit: Some notes on the History of the Aphorism*. Journal of the History of Ideas. Vol. 2, N.4 (Oct.), 1941
- Rolfe, J.C. *Suetonius*. Vol. 2. 1914. Reprint, London; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- Serman, I.Z. “Antioch Kantemir i Franchesko Algarotti”. *XVIII Bek* 21 (1999): 53–61.
- Siedina, Giovanna. “The Reception of Horace in the Courses of Poetics at the Kyiv Mohyla Academy: 17th-1st half of the 18th Century”. Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University, 2014.

- Silvares, Lavinia. *Nenhum homem é uma ilha: John Donne e a poética da agudeza*. São Paulo: Editora Fap-Unifesp, 2015.
- Skibina, S.N. “K Probleme Goratsiiankoy Ody v Russkoy Literaturnoy traditsii ("selskaya zhizn. K Afanasiu Matveevich Brianchaninovu' M.N. Muraviova)". *Vestnik OGU* 117, n° 11 (2010): 4–7.
- Smolyarova, T.I. *Mif o Poete Mifa: Pindar v Rossii i vo Frantsii*, 2013.
- Sorokin, Iu. S. *Slovar Russkogo Iazyka XVIII Veka*. 19 vols. Leningrad/St Peterburg: Nauka, 1984. <http://feb-web.ru/feb/sl18/slov-abc/>.
- Sviiasov, E.V. *Antichnaya poeziia v russkikh perevodakh XVIII-XX vv.: Bibliograficheski Ukazatel*. S. Peterburg: Izdatelstvo Dmitrii Bulanin, 1998.
- Usitalo, Steven A., e Gary Marker. *The invention of Mikhail Lomonosov: a Russian national myth*. Imperial encounters in Russian history. Brighton, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2013.
- Wes, Marinus Antony. *Classics in Russia 1700-1855: Between Two Bronze Horsemen*. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, v. 33. Leiden ; New York: E.J. Brill, 1992.
- Wolff, Robert Lee. “The Three Romes: The Migration of an Ideology and the Making of an Autocrat”. *Daedalus* 88, n° 2 (1959): 291–311.
- Zhivov, V. M. *Language and Culture in Eighteenth-Century Russia*. Studies in Russian and Slavic Literatures, Cultures and History. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2009.