

Dialect in poetic translations: The case of Robert Burns' poetry in Russia and in Slovenia

NATALIA KALOH VID, MIHAELA KOLETNIK

*Univerza v Mariboru, Filozofska fakulteta, Koroška cesta 160,
SI – 2000 Maribor, natalia.vid@um.si, mihaela.koletnik@um.si*

1.01 Izvirni znanstveni članek – 1.01 Original Scientific Article

Razprava osvetljuje prevod škotskega narečja v pesmih znamenitega škotskega pesnika Roberta Burnsa v ruščino in slovenščino. Burns je namreč v svojem pesniškem opusu spretno združil dve jezikovni tradiciji, pogovorno škotščino in knjižno angleščino, s čimer je med prvimi ustoličil pomen škotskega narečja kot sredstva za izražanje v književnosti. Avtor ruskega prevoda je Samuil Marshak, slovenskega pa Janez Menart. Izsledki analize kažejo, da se je Marshak v svojem prevodu skoraj popolnoma izognil rabi narečja ali narečno zaznamovanih besed, da bi ponazoril Burnsovo značilno prepletanje narečnih izrazov s knjižnimi, medtem ko Menart v svojem prevodu pogosto uporablja narečne in pogovorne izraze, pri čemer se poslužuje strategije kompenzacije.

The following paper examines the translation of the Scottish dialect in translations of the most famous Scottish poet, Robert Burns, into Russian and Slovene. Burns skilfully blended two linguistic traditions, vernacular Scottish and poetic Standard English, as the vehicle for poetic expression and became one of the first poets who established the significance of the Scottish dialect in literature. Burns' poetry was translated into Russian by Samuil Marshak and into Slovene by Janez Menart. The results of the analysis show that Marshak omitted the dialect, markers of dialect and even unmarked linguistic expression to illustrate Burns' characteristic blending of standard and non-standard speech. On the other hand, Menart often used non-standard and colloquial speech, implying the strategy of compensation.

Ključne besede: narečje, poezija, Robert Burns, Samuil Marshak, Janez Menart, prevodi

Key words: dialect, poetry, Robert Burns, Samuil Marshak, Janez Menart, translations

1 Introduction

Any dialect presents a challenge for any literary translator, testing his/her ability to understand, decode and successfully transfer a dialect, which can by no means be rendered mechanically. Naturally the simple replacement (substitution) of the source language dialect with its target language standard 'equivalent' is misleading and seen as rather unfavourable as it inevitably changes the meaning and the

style. When reading a faithful translation of a dialect, the reader should get a sense that the original text is written differently as if it were written in standard literary language and the translator's task is to make this possible.

Our analysis focuses on rendering of the Scottish dialect, or Scots, in translations of the Scottish poet, Robert Burns, made by Samuil Marshak in the Soviet Union (1947)¹ and Janez Menart (1975)² in Slovenia, former Yugoslavia. Our choice is not surprising, as there are not many poets in the world who succeeded in the careful blending of two linguistic traditions, as did Burns, using vernacular Scottish and poetic Standard English as the vehicle for poetic expression, thereby broadening the significance of the Scottish dialect. Thus the use of vernacular Scottish, or Scots, in Burns' poetry carries important, though implicit, information; hence, extensive domestication or even elimination of this component would significantly change the interpretive coordinates of the readers.

In our study, we draw attention to different choices made when translating Scots and discuss what these choices entail for the reader's perception. For an empirical part we chose the poem "The Twa Dogs"³ which is representative of Burns' poetry and the poet's use of Scots.⁴ Our comparative analysis focuses on the strategies used by translators when rendering Scots in terms of closeness to, or divergence from, the original. Our intention was to evaluate the translators' strategies in both cases and to answer the question of whether the translators' choices could have been dependent on the cultural, historical and political situation, as both translators lived and created under the stern conditions of the communist regime.

2 Translating a dialect

Language is not a unified system but can take many forms, called varieties. Contemporary linguistics treats varieties as different subsystems within a language system. Dialect is a non-standard linguistic variety (the same as colloquial language, slang and jargon), which is primarily used for communication and bears not only regional characteristics, but also social, occupational, educational and other features that determine its level of acceptability and prestige within a particular society. Regional languages and dialects should not be considered to be inferior to the national (standard) language in terms of their unifying capacity, but as the first language of most speakers, they should actually help in the acquisition of the standard language variety.

Although changes and shifts in any translation can never be entirely omitted, the neutralization of a dialect in a translation would mean violating double norms

¹ The poem "The Twa Dogs" was included in the anthology *Роберт Бернс в переводах С. Маршак. Избранное* (Robert Burns in Marshak's Translations. Selected) (1947). All together Marshak translated more than two hundred Burns' poems, songs and epigrams.

² The translation of the poem "The Twa Dogs" was included in the anthology *Burns*. (trans. by Janez Menart) (1975).

³ The Slovene and Russian translations of the poem "The Twa Dogs" reflect strategies and choices which were also characteristic of other translations of Burns by Menart and Marshak.

⁴ We focused only on vocabulary used in the original and in the translation. Other poetic features such as meter and rhyme were not included in the current analysis.

of translation: first, faithfulness to the original, and second, achieving the same aesthetic effect. Since expressions in dialect are charged with specific meanings and nuances, the absence of dialect in the target text would produce a “flattened” text (Bonaffini 1997: 279), and the linguistic and cultural differences expressed in the source text would be suppressed. Hence, the question that naturally arises is how to translate the dialect.⁵

Considering the importance of dialects in a large amount of literary works, one would expect the adequate strategies to render dialect in translation to be well studied. Ironically, however, dialect in translation⁶ has only recently begun to be analyzed and is often a part of a more general debate on a translatability of minor languages (e.g. Berezowski 1997; Bonaffini 1997; Grutman 2006; Brisset 2010; Cronin 2003). As Michael Cronin has pointed out, translation scholars have failed to discuss the issue of minority languages and dialects and show little awareness that minority language speakers' view and experience life from a distinct point of view (2003: 247). According to Cronin, if minority languages' point of view is analyzed, translation can be approached in two different ways: translation-as-assimilation (dialect is assimilated into the target standard language) or translation-as-diversification (dialect is retained in the target text in order to resist absorption by the major standard language) (2003: 252). In the latter case, translation would serve to stimulate and preserve the language, as well as to reinforce a sense of cultural identity different from the one represented through the standard language (Woodsworth 1996: 212).

Siljadi (1991: 32–33) states that ‘when translating dialects, it is not enough to merely know the target language and culture, but one must know and understand dialects as well.’ As translators usually do not live in the target country, the only help they may use when translating dialects are dictionaries, which are usually incomplete or do not exist at all. We should also take into consideration that the target language might not have all the linguistic instruments necessary to achieve the same effect as the original (e.g. the corresponding or adequate dialects, phonemes, diphthongs).

Identification of the dialect markers is, however, only one step in the translation process. It is also necessary to identify the dialect's role and function in the source language culture (*contextual preparation*). Therefore, a translator has to spend more time investigating the functional meaning of a dialect, as well as formal differences from the standard language. Ramos Pinto (2009: 292–296), on the basis of English-Portuguese translations, attempts to systematize tendencies in dialect rendition in a hierarchical model, highlighting that the first choice faced by the translator is between the preservation and non-preservation of the linguistic variation. The latter choice may result in the use of the standard variety only or of a single nonstandard variety. The preservation-of-variation path leads to four possibilities, defined by the decision to maintain or not to maintain “the space

⁵ Naturally there are numerous researches which refer to other types of literary translation, thus Vigar, for instance, wrote about the translation as the mutual reflection of neighbouring nations (2011: 72–79), and Kaloh Vid about teaching foreign language through literary translation (2018: 79–84).

⁶ The current analysis focuses on rendering of dialect and colloquial language in translations.

coordinates” and “the time coordinates” of the source text; each of those four possibilities results in more detailed strategies of rendering linguistic variation, e.g. the use of oral discourse features, reducing it to forms of address, the use of lexical, morphosyntactic, graphic or phonetic features from different varieties.

Dialect translating may be much swifter when a translator is familiar with the most frequent and general dialectal markers that may come into question within the process of translation. In order for the analysis to be trustworthy and of some benefit, it is essential, first of all, for the authors to know what exactly the original is about (Levý 1963: 200, 201). It is also possible that a certain amount of the differences between the original and the translation may have risen by mistake or due to the translator’s lack of language and stylistic skills and experience. Regardless, even if we assume that the translator of a dialect completely understands the original, we quickly discover that a major problem would be choosing an adequate translation strategy. The most tempting decision would perhaps be the choice of a dialect in the target language, but this simple replacement (substitution) of the source language dialect with its target language ‘equivalent’ is considered to be misleading and has fallen out of favour.⁷ Any specific nonstandard form (regional dialect) bears connotations that are too focused on a particular region to be appropriate for a radical substitution (Levý 1996: 127).

Rode lists several possibilities to render a dialect in a translation (1991: 29–30) (a) neglecting, which the translator achieves by neutralizing the dialect. This strategy might be adopted because of a generally agreed perspective of untranslatability of specific linguistic and cultural contents of dialects, but it brings significant changes – completely different associations for TL readers from those in the original; (b) the translator chooses one of the dialects in the target language and uses it. It introduces dialect markers on various levels of the language (phonetics, lexis, morphology and syntax), and so brings a different intertextuality into the translation (Berezowski 1997: 81). This strategy may appear too exclusive, as the users of another dialect would most likely experience alienation from the translation; (c) The translator only uses a few contents/elements from the target language dialect, thus signaling to the reader that a dialect was also used in the original; (d) the translator substitutes the original dialect with other linguistic varieties, for example, a non-standard variety, (lower-class) colloquial language and sometimes slang (a common practice in Slovene) to mark the difference. This strategy is most commonly used when translating dialects (Kovačič 1991: 23, Rode 1991: 30).

Finally, the use of explanatory notes or intertextual explanations may be a questionable strategy when translating a dialect. Translators often use explanatory notes or allusions that may help target language readers to understand the source text meaning, while always bearing in mind that these should be used very carefully. When explanations in any form are added to the translation, the question of subjectivity in evaluating the background of the readership and defining the criteria of what is ‘unfamiliar’ naturally arises. Rendering a dialect with the help

⁷ This is particularly difficult when translating into Slovene, as the Slovenian language distinguishes among more than fifty dialects organized into seven dialect groups (Ramovš 1935; Logar, Rigler 1983).

of explanatory notes is often impossible without ‘overloading’ the translation. This is especially true when even a reader of the source text does not get the same notes, as they may cause a negative *intellectualization* of the text (Levý 1963: 123, 148).⁸

3 Robert Burns and the use of Scots

Few poets anywhere in the world have acquired such unchallengeable status as national icons as Robert Burns (1759–1796), best-loved Scottish poet. Despite a lower-class upbringing and lack of formal education, Robert Burns, through his unusual and almost unacceptable poetry for that time, rose from poverty and neglect to glory. His life and work, as a poet and a songwriter, provided a focus for the incipient revival in Scottish poetry and, in particular, for writing in the Scottish vernacular. Burns’ enormously popular work established several fashions in poetry that have remained influential even to this day, as Robert Burns is, undoubtedly, not only the most famous Scottish bard but also one of the greatest figures in European poetry of the eighteenth century. Wordsworth identified ‘the presence of human life’ in his poetry and Scott believed that, of all the authors he had known, only Burns and Byron wrote with complete spontaneity (qtd. in Low 1975: 2). There have been so many editions of Burns that J. W. Egerer, the author of *Bibliography of Robert Burns* (1964: viii), believed that his popularity in the last century may have been even greater than Shakespeare’s. Combining Standard English with the Scottish vernacular, Burns liberated the language, allowing freedom during the Romantic Movement, and his use of old folk tunes enhanced Scottish musical tradition. Unfortunately, Burns was only a writer for twenty years,⁹ but in that time, he published hundreds of poems, songs, epigrams and letters.

The use of the Scottish vernacular¹⁰ has a special place in Burns studies. Thomas Crawford suggested that the difference between English and the Scottish vernacular was not ‘a matter of different languages but rather different registers of usage within the same language’ (1979: 11). That could be true for Scots, but not for English critics. During the poet’s life, his use of vernacular was obviously a potential disqualification for success as a poet because his poetry differed so much from the prevailing mode of polite English literature in his colloquial speech and humour and his lowbrow themes. According to Sampson, it was only after the poet’s death that his use of language was discussed by English reviewers as a poetic style (1985: 16). It should be noted that Burns’ earlier work is written in Standard English (e.g. “Song Composed in August” or “Mary Morison”). It was

⁸ Perhaps this strategy can be used if merely a few dialect words or expressions occur in the original.

⁹ Burns died at the age of thirty-seven.

¹⁰ Scottish English has had a long tradition as an independent national language. Even when the country lost its political independence by the Act of Union in 1706, the literary tradition was not lost, and the local speech was not replaced by the London variety. Using Scottish English in literary works was in favour with many authors. The contemporary linguistic situation in Scotland is such that there is a difference between Southern English, which is officially used and taught in the schools, and various forms of native speech. So there is native Lowland English, and the Gaelic language spoken in the Highlands.

his later choice to use the Scottish dialect as a vehicle for poetic expression that embraced the local, national and international.

As Carol McGuirk observes, Burns' careful blending of 'vernacular Scottish enlivens the sentimental, while the generalizing, self-consciously poetic English component broadens the significance of the vernacular [to create] an inimitable effect of meaningful simplicity, an effect by no means characteristic of all poets in the Scottish folk tradition' (1985: xxii). According to Liam McIlvanney:

There is little warrant for viewing eighteenth-century Scottish culture as bifurcated between two monolithic and antagonistic movements, the Scottish Enlightenment and the Vernacular Revival: the one, a cosmopolitan movement, concerned to explore a universal 'science of man' through the medium of metropolitan English; the other, a movement to preserve and valorize native language and traditions, maintaining cultural difference and distinct national manners. (2005: 28).

Burns was especially praised for his skill in wedding the two linguistic traditions. According to David Murison (1975: 54), Burns had two languages at his disposal because, despite the fact that Scots and English were essentially dialects of the same original language, Anglo-Saxon, Scots had a considerable Norse element and some Dutch, French and Gaelic not shared with English. The vowel and to a lesser extent the consonant system were different. There were some distinctions in the grammar forms, especially in the verbs, and there were a great many subtle distinctions in syntax and idiom. Considering the fact that these differences had been established by the late fifteenth century, it was possible to talk about two distinct languages. Scots prose was reduced to the level of a dialect, and in the eighteenth century it hardly existed as a literary form. In verse, however, it was not lost. According to Thomas Crawford, Burns 'found himself poised between two languages, two mental worlds' (1994: 2), skillfully manipulating colloquial Scots. Perhaps, Burns' language should be termed 'near-English' or 'Scots-English.

Orthographical features of Scottish dialect, often used in Burns' poetry include:

- 1) reduced endings (fi' (full), fa' (fall), ca'(call), hae (have), ha (hand), min (mind), rattlin' (rattling);
- 2) voiceless *d* at the end of the words (use't (used), likit (liked);
- 3) use of *ie* instead of English *y* at the end of the word (Willie, bonnie, leddie);
- 4) diagraphs *ae* (fae (foe), nae (no), *ai*: laird (lord), *au*: auld (old), *eu*: beuk (book), and *ui*: guid (good);
- 5) a sound (*x*) that is absent in English language (Lochryan, fecht);
- 6) use of the vowel *i* (mither, thegither, wurd) instead of *o* (mother, together, world) and *a* (na, wha) instead of English *o* (no, who).

Among the lexical features are:

- 1) nouns such as e'e (eye) and shoo (shoe), which have the ending *n* in plural form (een, shoon);
- 2) regular use of the plural subject *ye* instead of the standard 'you';
- 3) instead of 'not' *no* and *na* are also used (*no* is used after and separated from the verb and *na* together with a verb to form a single word (wasna, didna, hadna);

4) *so* is used instead of *if*

Dialectal synonyms in Burns' poetry can be divided into three groups (Keith 1956: 128–130): synonymic orders from Scottish dialect and the North England dialect; synonymic orders that combine dialect words and words from Standard English and mixed synonymic orders. The first group contains words that belong to different Scottish dialects but share the same semantic identity. They are distinguishable from each other only through pronunciation, which depends on the geographical position of the dialect. For instance *ahin/behint* – *behind* ('ahin' belongs to the Aberdeen dialect, 'behint' to the Lancashire and North Derby dialect); *ault/eilid* – *old, old age* ('ault' belongs to different North and South dialects, 'eilid' to the Lancashire dialect); *aneugh/aneuch, eneugh/enow* – *enough* ('aneugh' – Aberdeen dialect, 'aneuch' – Yorkshire and Derby dialects, 'enough' – Cumberland dialect, 'enow' – South Scotland dialect) and *gae/gang* – *go* ('gae' – North Lancashire dialect, 'gang' – Dorset dialect).

Words or word expressions that can be (or were) changed to similar words or word groups belong to the second group. Besides dialect words Standard English words and archaic words used only in dialects also belong to this group. For example *daintie/ couthie/ leesome* (*daintie* – exquisite, of delicate beauty, *couthie* – agreeable, genial, kindly and *leesome* – lucky, fortunate, agreeable); *billie/ carl/ chiel/ cock/ loon* (*billie* – abbreviated "William", *carl* – a strong, robust fellow, *chiel* – a young man, fellow, *cock* – a person who plays minor parts in a large organization, community, and *loon* – a worthless, sorrowful or lazy fellow); *cantie/ darf/ gawsie* (*cantie* – cheerful, lovely, *darf* – insane, crazy, simple, foolish and *gawsie* – well-dressed, of cheerful appearance) and *crunzie/ gab/ mouth* (*crunzie* – throat, mouth, *cab* – slang mouth) (Keith 1956: 128–130).

Mixed synonymic orders are presented through geographically variable variants: *claeding, claethin, clouts, claes; chiel/child, loon, loun, lown; fiere, frien, frined*.

4 Comparative analysis of the translations of 'The Twa Dogs'

The current analysis focuses on Marshak's and Menart's translations of Burns' poem "The Twa Dogs," written partly in Scots and partly in Standard English. The poem is organized in the form of a dialogue between two dogs, Caesar and Luath, who are good friends, though Caesar belongs to a lord and Luath to a ploughman. The fundamental idea of their statements is the division of society into classes and its effect upon the quality of individual life. The central theme of the poem appears to be the claim that virtue does not depend on wealth and that peasants can be even better men than the gentry, even though they are well aware of their miserable position.¹¹

¹¹ According to Crawford, considering the fact that the convictions that Burns expresses in 'The Twa Dogs' reflect the interests of rural democracy as conceived by small farmers and agricultural laborers in Scotland in the 1780s, the poem possesses a certain documentary merit (1960: 173).

We listed examples from the originals and from both the Russian and Slovenian translations, focusing only on lexical features (covering any specific Scottish, Slovenian and Russian dialectal vocabulary). Considering phonetic, morphological or syntactical features would exceed the limits of the current analysis. For the sake of clarity, lexical items characteristic of Scots are translated into Standard English, while the shifts in translations are in bold with an explanation provided in brackets. Putting the analysis of translation solutions in tables with numerical data might be problematic and ambiguous because the very nature of the analysis is subjective (but so are the individual translations as well as the readers' perspectives). However, for those extracts concerned, the numerical expressions clearly illustrate the number of dialect markers in both translations relative to the number of dialect markers in the original and the only generalization drawn from these numbers is the fact that a certain translation strategy seems to be used frequently, while others are out of favour.

Scots	Robert Burns	Janez Menart ¹²	Samuil Marshak ¹³
<p><i>aften – often</i>¹⁴ <i>O' – of</i>; <i>An' – and</i>; <i>Liv'd – lived</i>; <i>Ava – at all</i></p>	<p>(1) I've aften wonder'd, honest Luath, What sort o' life poor dogs like you have; An' when the gentry's life I saw, What way poor bodies liv'd ava. (1996: 141)</p>	<p>Glej, večkrat tuhtam¹⁵ kako živi Tak reven pes, Luath, kot si ti; In v pasjo glavo mi ne gre, Da revni sploh lahko žive. (1975: 176)</p> <p><i>(the use of collo- quial language)</i></p>	<p>Мой честный Люат! Верно, тяжкий Удел¹⁶ достался вам, бедняжки.¹⁷ Я знаю только высший круг, Которому жилицы лачуг Должны платить за землю птицей, Углем, и шерстью, и пшеницей (1982: 123)</p> <p><i>(the use of archaic vocabulary and colloquial language Marshak also added two lines)</i>¹⁸</p>

¹² We identified Standard Slovene (SS) equivalents for all colloquial, dialectal and archaic expressions used in Menart's translation and translated them to Standard English (SE).

¹³ We identified Standard Russian (SR) equivalents for all colloquial, dialectal and archaic expressions in Marshak's translation and translated them to Standard English (SE).

¹⁴ We used a Dictionary of Scots Language available at: <https://dsl.ac.uk/>.

¹⁵ SS: *premišljati*; SE: to think.

¹⁶ SR: *судьба*, SE: destiny.

¹⁷ SR: *бедняга*; SE: poor thing.

¹⁸ Marshak not only interpreted the source language text but also often explicated it.

Scots	Robert Burns	Janez Menart	Samuil Marshak
<p><i>trowth – truth;</i> <i>fash't- bothered;</i> <i>enough – enough;</i> <i>howkin – to dig;</i> <i>sheugh – a ditch;</i> <i>wi' – with;</i> <i>biggin – building;</i> <i>an' – and;</i> <i>sic – such</i></p>	<p>(2)</p> <p>Trowth, Caesar, whiles they're fash't enugh: A cottar howkin in a sheugh, Wi' dirty stanes biggin a dyke, Baring a quarry, an' sic like; (1996: 142)</p>	<p>Res, Cezar, to so hude reve; Tak kočar.¹⁹ kramp²⁰ vihti²¹ vse dneve, Iz blatnih kamnov škrape²² zida On sploh počne stvari nič prida;²³ (1975: 176)</p> <p><i>(the use of an archaic vocabulary and stylistically marked vocabulary)</i></p>	<p>Ах, Цезарь, я у тех живу, Кто дни проводит в грязном рву, Копается в земле и в глине На мостовой и на плотине. (1982: 123)</p> <p><i>(the use of a colloquial interjection)</i></p>
<p><i>sae – so;</i> <i>sic – such;</i> <i>wad – would;</i> <i>stinking – stinking</i></p>	<p>(3)</p> <p>My Lord! Our gentry care sae little For delvers, ditchers and sic cattle They gang as saucy by poor folk, As I wad by a stinkin brock. (1996: 142)</p>	<p>Gospodu tak krampač,²⁴ vrtnar je manj kot pes, kot krava mar in mimo njih se jim mudi, kot da dihurji bi bili. (1975: 177)</p> <p><i>(the use of a stylistically marked vocabulary)</i></p>	<p>Все эти лорды на холопов²⁵ – На землеробов, землекопов - Глядят с презреньем, свысока, Как мы с тобой на барсука! (1982: 124)</p> <p><i>(the use of an archaic vocabulary)</i></p>

¹⁹ SS: lastnik zelo majhnega kmečkega posestva; SE: the owner of a very little farm.

²⁰ SS: orodje za kopanje, navadno s sekalom in konico; SE: a digging tool, usually with a chopping block and a tip.

²¹ SS: opravljati s kakim orodjem zanj značilno delo; SE: to perform a work with a specific tool.

²² The lexeme *škrapa* with a synonym *škraplja* has a geographical connotation in Standard Slovene and means 'deep elongated recess in the limestone surface caused by the chemical reaction of water'. In dolensko-kostelski dialect this lexeme also means 'cave'.

²³ This lexeme is used with the negative *nič* and in SS means *nič koristnega, nič dobrega*; SE: nothing good, nothing useful.

²⁴ SS: delavec, ki koplje s krampom; SE: The worker who works with a hack.

²⁵ SR: крестьянин, принадлежащий помещику; SE: peasant who belonged to the landlord.

Scots	Robert Burns	Janez Menart	Samuil Marshak
<p><i>frae – from; e'en – evening; nought – night; an' – and; stechin – to stuff with food; ev'n – down; ha' – hall; pechan – the stomach; wi' – with; an' – and; sic – such; trashtrie – small trash; wastrie – wasteful</i></p>	<p>(4)</p> <p>Frae morn to e'en, it's nought but toiling At baking, roasting, frying, boiling; An' tho' the gentry first are stechin, Yet ev'n the ha' folk fill their pechan Wi' sauce, ragouts, an' sic like trashtrie, That's little short o' downright wastrie. (1996: 141)</p>	<p>Pri nas vse božje dneve vre, se kuha, poha,²⁶ peče, cvre; in ko gospoda se napoka,²⁷ še služinčad si v vamp²⁸ nažoka²⁹ raguje, kreme in rolade³⁰ in vse, kar še od mize pade: (1975: 177)</p> <p><i>(the use of colloquial language, stylistically marked vocabulary, lower colloquial language and colloquial language with a negative connotation)</i></p>	<p>До ночи повар наш хлопочет, Печет и жарит, варит, мочит, Сперва попощует³¹ господ, Потом и слугам раздает Супы, жаркие и варенья, - Что ни обед, то разоренье! Не только первого слугу Здесь кормят соусом, рагу (1982: 124)</p> <p><i>(the use of archaic vocabulary)</i></p>
<p><i>hae – have; maun – must</i></p>	<p>(5)</p> <p>I see how folk live that hae riches; But surely poor-folk maun be wretches! (1996: 142)</p>	<p>Poznam življenje bogatinov,³² pa tudi bedo teh trpinov.³³ (1975: 178)</p> <p><i>(the use of stylistically and archaic vocabulary)</i></p>	<p>Не знает счастья нищий люди. Его удел – нужда и труд! (1982: 125)</p> <p><i>(the use of a higher register)</i></p>

²⁶ SS: cvreti; SE: to fry.

²⁷ SS: najesti se; SE: to eat too much.

²⁸ SS: trebuh (loaned from Middle High German *wamp*); SE: stomach.

²⁹ SS: napolniti; SE: to fill in.

³⁰ SS: pecivo iz zvitega biskvitnega testa (loaned from German *Roulade* and French *rouler*); SE: a rolled biscuit.

³¹ SR: угощать; SE: to treat.

³² SS: bogataš; SE: a rich man.

³³ SS: trpeč človek. SE: someone who suffers.

Scots	Robert Burns	Janez Menart	Samuil Marshak
<p><i>no – not; saw – so; ane – one; poortith – poverty; sae – so; accustom'd – accustomed; wi' – with; o't – of it</i></p>	<p>(6)</p> <p>They're no sae wretched's ane wad think. Tho' constantly on poortith's brink, They're sae accustom'd wi' the sight, The view o't gives them little fright. (1996: 143)</p>	<p>Saj z njimi ni tako hudo, Kot bi kdo mislil; res jih tro³⁴ Skrbi za kruh, a ker vse dni jih tarejo, še mar jim ni. (1975: 178)</p> <p><i>(the use of stylistically marked vocabulary)</i></p>	<p>Нет, несмотря на все напасти,³⁵ И бедняку знакомо счастье. Знавал он голод и мороз - И не боится их угроз. (1982: 125)</p> <p><i>(the use of colloquial language)</i></p>
<p><i>nae – no; cauld – could; e'er – ever; o't – of it; na – no</i></p>	<p>(7)</p> <p>But will ye tell me, Master Caesar, Sure great folk's life's a life o' pleasure? Nae cauld nor hunger e'er can steer them, The very thought o't need na fear them. (1996: 145)</p>	<p>A čuj,³⁶ kajne, da ti ljudje Na svetu lepo živje? Ne mraz ne lakota nikdar Še v sanjah nista jim nič mar. (1975: 179)</p> <p><i>(the use of colloquial language)</i></p>	<p>Теперь скажи: твой высший свет Вполне ли счастлив или нет? (1982: 126)</p> <p><i>(omitting a form of address and the use of a rhetorical question)</i></p>
<p><i>hech – exclamation; sae – so; mony – money; braw – fine; sae – so; foughten – troubled; an' – and; harass's – harassed; gear – money; gang – go; gate – way</i></p>	<p>(8)</p> <p>Hech, man! dear sirs! is that the gate They waste sae mony a brawestate! Are we sae foughten an' harass'd For gear to gang that gate at last? (1996: 145)</p>	<p>Glej, glej, tako je s tem? Zato Je kup³⁷ grofij na kant prišlo.³⁸ In nas zato tako peste,³⁹ Da cvenk⁴⁰ potem na tuje gre? (1975: 179)</p> <p><i>(the use of stylistically marked vocabulary and a colloquial idiom)</i></p>	<p>Я вижу, эти господа Растратят скоро без следа Свои поля, свои дубравы... Порой и нас мутит лукавый.⁴¹ (1982: 126)</p> <p><i>(the use of archaic phraseological expression)</i></p>

³⁴ SS: povzročati, da je kdo v zelo neprijetnem položaju; SE: to cause a very unpleasant situation.

³⁵ SR: бедствие; SE: adversity.

³⁶ SS: poslušati; SE: to listen.

³⁷ SS: velika količina, množina; SE: high quantity of something.

³⁸ SS: obubožati, gospodarsko propasti; SE: to impoverish, to be ruined financially.

³⁹ SS: povzročati, da je kdo v zelo neprijetnem, težkem položaju; SE: to cause a very unpleasant, difficult situation.

⁴⁰ SS: denar; SE: money.

⁴¹ An archaic expression which can be translated as "deceived by an evil spirit".

Scots	Robert Burns	Janez Menart	Samuil Marshak
<p><i>an' – and;</i> <i>ev'n – even;</i> <i>an' – and;</i> <i>through – make</i> <i>good;</i> <i>sic – such;</i> <i>an' – and</i></p>	<p>(9)</p> <p>An' ev'n their sports, their balls an' races, Their galloping trough public places, There's sic parade, sic pomp, an' art, The joy can scarcely reach the heart. (1996: 146)</p>	<p>Še ježa, šport, igranje z žogo Pri njih je spakedrano,⁴² togo In polno pompa, da ne zna, Ne more radost do srca. (1975: 180)</p> <p><i>(the use of colloquial language with a negative connotation)</i></p>	<p>Не веселит их светский бал, Ни маскарад, ни карнавал, Ни скачка бешеным галопом По людным улицам и тропам... Все напоказ,⁴³ чтоб видел свет, А для души отрады нет! (1982: 126)</p> <p><i>(the use of a dialect)</i></p>
<p><i>Gat – to beget;</i> <i>An' – and;</i> <i>Rejoic'd – rejoiced;</i> <i>werena – were not;</i> <i>an' – and;</i> <i>aff – off;</i> <i>resolv'd – resolved;</i> <i>ither – other</i></p>	<p>(10)</p> <p>When up they gat an' shook their lugs, Rejoic'd they werena men but dogs; An' each took aff his several way, Resolv'd to meet some ither day. (1996: 146)</p>	<p>Pa srečna vstala sta oba, Da nista človek, da sta psa, In sta odšla vsak v svojo stran, Da spet dobita se⁴⁴ kak dan. (1975: 180)</p> <p><i>(the use of colloquial language)</i></p>	<p>Когда простились оба пса. Ушами длинными тряхнули, Хвостами дружески махнули, Пролаяв: – Славно, черт возьми,⁴⁵ Что бог не создал нас людьми! (1982: 126)</p> <p><i>(the use of colloquial language)</i></p>

The results of the analysis illustrate that Marshak eliminated the original dialect almost completely, substituting it instead with standard Russian. The translator avoided any non-standard, colloquial variety or even unmarked linguistic expression to allude to the differences between standard and non-standard speech in his translations. There are almost no linguistic markers, which may illustrate the idea that the original is not written in literary language apart from “*ax*”, “*напоказ*” and “*черт возьми*”. A few archaic words could hardly fill this gap. Such a strategy leveled the speech of all characters and inevitably ignored the meanings embedded in the original’s heteroglossia. Moreover, Marshak changed the expressional quality of the original significantly by introducing rhetorical questions, omitting lines and changing the register from colloquial to standard literary.

On the other hand, Menart did not neutralize the dialect in the original and though he did not choose any Slovenian dialect, he compensated by choosing a non-standard colloquial variety combined with stylistically marked language and a few lexical units from dialectal vocabulary. In the preface to the edition, Menart explained that ‘I used literary standard Slovene to translate standard English, as for translating Scots, I did not use any particular Slovenian dialect but a more “loose”

⁴² SS: izmaličiti; SE: to diminish.

⁴³ SR: наружу, на всеобщее обозрение; SE: for show.

⁴⁴ SS: sestati se; SE: to have a meeting.

⁴⁵ A colloquial expression which can be translated as “oh, my gosh”.

and, according to contemporary vocal reduction, formed simple register, like that of folk songs' (1975: 103). Following this principle, Menart avoided both the mechanical recreating of all source dialectal markers, omitting them altogether by using:

- (1) expressive marked vocabulary:
 - *vihteti kramp, prida, krampač, mar, nažokati, trpin, tret, kup, pestiti, cvenk*, as well as words that express disdain and a negative attitude such as: *spakedrati* and *vamp*;

- (2) colloquial and dialectal vocabulary
 - colloquial: *tuhtam, pohati, rolada, čujem, priti na kant, dobiti se*
 - dialect: *škrapa*

- (3) archaic and rare vocabulary
 - archaic: *kočar*
 - rarely used: *bogatin*

Thus, Menart succeeded to a greater extent than Marshak in keeping Burns' lively, authentic, every-day and informal colloquial language by using a type of stylistically restricted vocabulary that would not be used in texts that require the use of a standard literary language.

5 Conclusion

The results illustrate that Marshak eliminated the dialect, almost completely substituting it with standard language. Considering the cultural dependency of every dialect and the importance of dialect outlined in the introduction, this decision in favour of complete neutralization seems rather unusual, yet this choice may have depended on censors and editors and the mainstream idea of Soviet literature, which was meant to promote literary, clear, non-colloquial Russian language. Yet, the curious fact is that in spite of all the changes and deviations in Marshak's translations of 'The Twa Dogs' or any other of Burns' poems, they still became enormously popular in the Soviet Union, have been republished and have sold millions of copies.⁴⁶ Surprisingly, even more than twenty-five years after the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991, Marshak's translations of Burns still dominate the literary market, almost completely overshadowing contemporary translations. Burns could have never achieved such extraordinary assimilation in a foreign cultural milieu without such successful translations. This fact contributes to the assumption that, in spite of numerous inaccuracies and deviations from the original, Marshak's translations were high in literary quality.

Rendering the original dialect much more faithfully, Menart chose a non-standard colloquial variety combined with stylistically marked language and a few lexical units from dialectal vocabulary. Thus, he avoided mechanically recreating all source dialectal markers as well as avoiding omitting them altogether. Hence,

⁴⁶ Burns' songs in Marshak's translations can be heard in famous films, on TV and on the radio.

the questions of why Menart's more accurate translations of Burns were never republished after the first edition was released and why Burns was never integrated into the Slovenian culture to the same extent as in the Soviet Union, still remain. One possible answer is that Marshak's translations became so popular in the Soviet Union due to their systematic and strictly organized approach to literary production and distribution, while the publishing and editorial policy in the former Yugoslavia were different and Menart's translations were never promoted to the same extent as Marshak's were in the Soviet Union.

REFERENCES

- Leszek BEREZOWSKI, 1997: *Dialect in Translation*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Luigi BONAFFINI, 1997: Translating Dialect Literature. *World Literature Today* 71/2, 279–288.
- Robert BURNS, 1996: *Selected Poems*. London: Penguin Popular Classics.
- , 1975: *Burns, Robert, 1759–1796: Poezija*. Trans.: Janez Menart. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.
- , 1982: *Stikhi*. Trans.: Samuil Marshak. Moscow: Raduga.
- Thomas CRAWFORD, 1979: *Society and the Lyric: A Study of the Song Culture of Eighteenth-Century Scotland*. Edinburgh: Scottish academic press.
- , 1960: *Burns (A Study of the Poems and Songs)*. Edinburgh and London: Oliver & Boyd.
- Michael CRONIN, 2003: *Translation and Globalization*. Routledge: London.
- Dictionary of Scots Language*. Available at: <https://dsl.ac.uk/> (last accessed 7.2.2020).
- Natalia KALOH VID, 2018: Prevajanje pri pouku tujega jezika: poučevanje ruskega jezika s pomočjo angleških literarnih prevodov. *Slavia Centralis* XI/1, 79–84.
- Christina KEITH, 1956: *The Russet Coat (a Critical Study of Burns' Poetry and of its Background)*. London: Robert Hale Limited.
- Irena KOVAČIČ, 1991: Jezikovne zvrsti in podnaslovno prevajanje. 15. prevajalski zbornik. *Prevajanje dialektov in žargonov*. Eds. Irena Trenc Frelj, Aleš Berger and Jaroslav Skrušny. Ljubljana: Zbornik društva slovenskih književnih prevajalcev. 20–27.
- Jiří LEVÝ, 1963: *Umění překladu*. Praha: Československý spisovatel.
- , 1996: České teorie překladu. *Vývoj překladatelských teorií a metod v české literatuře I*. Ed. Jiří Honzík. Praha: Ivo Železný.
- Tine LOGAR, Jakob RIGLER, 1983: *Karta slovenskih narečij*. Ljubljana: Geodetski zavod Slovenije.
- Donald A. LOW, 1975: *Critical Essays on Robert Burns*. London: Routledge.
- Carol MCGUIRK, 1985: *Robert Burns and the Sentimental Era*. Athens: University of Georgia P.
- Liam MCILVANNEY, 2005: Hugh Blair, Robert Burns, and the Invention of Scottish Literature. *Eighteenth-century life* 29/2, 25–46.
- David MURISON, 1975: The Language of Burns. *Critical Essays on Robert Burns*. Ed. David Low. London: Routledge. 54–69.

Sara RAMOS PINTO, 2009: How important is the way you put it? A discussion on the translation of linguistic varieties. *Target* 21/2, 289–307.

Fran RAMOVŠ, 1935: *Historična gramatika slovenskega jezika VII. Dialekti*. Ljubljana: Učiteljska tiskarna.

Matej RODE, 1991: Narečje kot prevajalski problem. *15. prevajalski zbornik. Prevajanje dialektov in žargonov*. Eds. Irena Trenc Freljih, Aleš Berger and Jaroslav Skrušny. Ljubljana: Zbornik društva slovenskih književnih prevajalcev. 28–31.

David SAMPSON, 1985: Robert Burns: The Revival of Scottish Literature? *The Modern Language Review* 80/1, 16–38.

Karolj SILADJI, 1991: Na ivici mogočeg i nemogočeg. *15. prevajalski zbornik. Prevajanje dialektov in žargonov*. Eds. Irena Trenc Freljih, Aleš Berger and Jaroslav Skrušny. Ljubljana: Zbornik društva slovenskih književnih prevajalcev. 32–35.

Alenka VALH LOPERT, Mihaela KOLETNIK, 2018: *Non-standard Features of the Slovene Language in Slovene Popular Culture*. Maribor: Univerza v Mariboru, Filozofska fakulteta. (Mednarodna knjižna zbirka Zora, 127).

Zoltán VIRÁG, 2011: Translation as the mutual reflection of neighbouring nations (About the cultural activity of Kornél Szentelky). *Slavia Centralis* IV/1, 72–79.

Joseph WEGERER, 1965: *A Bibliography of Robert Burns*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Judith WOODSWORTH, 1996: Language, Translation and the Promotion of National Identity: Two Test Cases. *Target* 8/2, 21–38.

NAREČJE V PREVODIH POEZIJE: PRIMER POEZIJE ROBERTA BURNSA V RUSIJI IN SLOVENIJI

Članek osvetljuje prevod škotskega narečja v pesmih znamenitega škotskega pesnika Roberta Burnsa v ruščino in slovenščino. Burns je namreč v svojem pesniškem opusu spretno združil dve jezikovni tradiciji, pogovorno škotščino in knjižno angleščino, s čimer je med prvimi ustoličil pomen škotskega narečja kot sredstva za izražanje v književnosti. Da je škotsko narečje samosvoje in zelo raznoliko, kaže slovarček, ki ga je dodal npr. pesmi *Halloween* in v katerem je razložil pomen posameznih škotskih izrazov. V prispevku se osredotočava na prevod Burnsovih pesmi v ruščino in slovenščino, pri čemer ocenjujeva prevajalske strategije na ravni posamičnih besed v obeh prevodih. Ob tem naju zanima še, če so prevajalčevim odločitvam morda botrovali tudi kulturna tradicija, zgodovinske ali politične razmere, saj sta oba prevajalca živela in ustvarjala v času komunističnega režima, ki je strogo začrtal način življenja in ravnanja posameznikov. Avtor ruskega prevoda, nastalega v nekdanji Sovjetski zvezi, je Samuil Marshak, slovenskega, nastalega v Sloveniji v času nekdanje Jugoslavije, pa Janez Menart. Izsledki raziskave kažejo, da se je Marshak v svojem prevodu skoraj popolnoma izognil rabi narečja ali narečno zaznamovanih besed, da bi ponazoril Burnsovo značilno prepletanje narečnih izrazov s knjižnimi. Upoštevajoč vpetost dialekta v kulturno okolje, je Marshakova odločitev, ki je v prid prevajalski strategiji nevtralizacije narečja, nekoliko ne- navadna. Kljub temu so bili Marshakovi prevodi v nekdanji Sovjetski zvezi zelo priljubljeni, o čemer pričajo milijonske naklade, številni ponatisi Burnsa v prevodu tega prevajalca pa kažejo, da njegova priljubljenost vse do danes ni upadla. Na drugi strani Menart v svojem prevodu pogosto uporablja narečne in pogovorne izraze, pri čemer se poslužuje strategije kompenzacije. Za razliko od Marshakovih pa njegovi prevodi niso bili nikoli ponatisnjeni.