

DAVID SAMOILOV'S POEM "THE MUSEUM" IN TRANSLATION BY JAAN KROSS (from the Collection "Bottomless Moments")*

TATIANA STEPANISCHEVA

The present article is concerned with Samoilov's first text in the collection and its translation: the poem "The Museum" (1961), first published in 1963 in the journal "Novyi mir". Its placement as the first text of the compilation was clearly not accidental. The volume includes too few of Samoilov's works to provide an impression of the author's creative evolution. Nonetheless, "Bottomless Moments" is generally, though not strictly, organized chronologically: "Ivan's Death", before 1953; "The Ballad of the German Censor", 1958; "The Frequenter", 1978; "Richter", 1981; "Afanasy Fet", not later than 1980; "The Gulf", 1978, and so on. One exception is "The Museum", which is definitively situated "out of order". In its time, after its first publication, it was understood as a satirical piece (regarding this, see: [Немзер, Тумаркин: 668–669]), and later was regarded also as a parody (regarding this, see: [Солженицын]). The next poems in the compilation are totally lacking in parodic overtones ("Ivan's Death" and "The Ballad of the German Censor"), a further reason that the placement of "The Museum" at the beginning seems rather unusual. It may be assumed that something else dominates the meaning of this poem, something that allows it to dictate the tone of the entire collection. This article will attempt to determine what this dominant element is.

The ironic premise of "The Museum" arises from the theme of doubt in the necessity of museums dedicated to poets or writers; dusty collections of mundane objects have been long-running cultural and literary motifs (examples can be found from Pasternak to Dovlatov). The quote in the epigraph, supposedly

* The article was written under the research theme TFLGR 0469 "Reception of Russian Literature in Estonia in the 20th Century: from the Interpretation to Translation". First version was published in Russian: Блоковский сборник, XVIII. Тарту, 2010. С. 185–202.

from a “book of reviews”, immediately sets the genre and style tone of the text: “... it produces profound...”. The first epigraph, “from an old poet” (a pseudo-quote, full of recognizable poeticisms and referring to a catalog of poetic works familiar to the reader) is rendered ironic by the second epigraph, and the poeticisms in it acquire a comedic, nearly clownish, undertone.

Behind the external parody, it seems, few have paid attention to the next layer, the internal plot of the poem: the fate of the poet, presented by a narrow-minded, though attentive, tour guide.

That the employees of the Apartment Museum of Pushkin attribute the poem to their own account has textual foundation. References in “The Museum” to Pushkin’s fate are frequent and recognizable. In addition to the allusions noted by commentators to the posthumous fate of Lensky in the line “A carol? Or candy?” [Немзер, Тумаркин: 669] and the quote from Lermontov at the end of the poem (“The death of a poet is the last paragraph”, see: [Немзер 2006: 166]), a number of other allusory details can be pinpointed.

For example, the “poet’s couch” can be compared to the leather sofa in Pushkin’s office in his Apartment Museum at 12 Moika.

The portrait (“here the poet is fourteen years old. / For some reason he was made a brunette”) recalls Pushkin’s portrait, found in the 1822 publication of “The Captive of the Caucasus” and printed with the engravings of Y. Geitman. The “anonymous” portrait in Samoilov’s poem corresponds to Pushkin’s historical image: arguments about the “original” Geitman used for his engravings and speculations about the author of that original have long occupied the spare time of Pushkin scholars, who have suggested that the portrait’s author may even have been Karl Bryullov. Some scholars consider the image a “childhood” portrait of Pushkin (Vengerov, Ashukin; regarding this, see, for example: [Борский: 961–962]). Thus, Ashukin suggested that Pushkin is depicted at “between 12 and 24 years of age”, “in a shirt with an open neck, with dark, curly hair” [Ашукин: 22]. In the Russian cultural consciousness the “Moor” Pushkin is considered to be, of course, a brunette. For now, there is no evidence that suggests that Samoilov recalled (or even knew of) Ashukin’s work. But the “youth” of the poet, the manner in which the portrait does not correspond to the realities of the subject’s physical features (“was made a brunette”), and the discussion surrounding the portrait (“all the scholars argue about this”) all recall the iconography of Pushkin.

There is, apparently, no equivalent in the iconography of Pushkin to the “dashing” (udaloi) portrait in “The Museum”. In this epithet one can see metonymy, marked by the author’s irony, with the “Romanticism” of Pushkin

in his "Liudmila and Ruslan" period¹; it can also be supposed that this characteristic developed under the influence of the recollections of Pushkin's contemporaries about him².

The exile "to Kaluga" due to "the ode 'Down with'" can be interpreted as an allusion to a series of events in Pushkin's biography. The Linen Works estate, located in the Kaluga province, was received by N. N. Goncharova as dowry; Pushkin spent time there at least twice, in 1830 and in 1834. The ode "Freedom", which became one of the reasons for Pushkin's exile to the south, does not contain the words "down with" (they appear only three times in the entire body of Pushkin's work), but can be read as a call "to strike the defect on the throne".

The frock-coat in "The Museum", shot through with a bullet from a duel, needs no further "Pushkinist" interpretation — this particular item (along with the sofa) comprises the center of the exposition in the Apartment Museum on the Moika. The frock-coat in which Pushkin went to the place of the duel was later given to V. I. Dahl, who described it thus: "... I obtained from Zhukovsky the final clothing of Pushkin, after which they dressed him only to put him in his casket: a black frock-coat, with a small hole the size of a fingernail against the right abdomen" [Вебераев: II, 456]. In the recollections of his contemporaries about him, Pushkin's frock-coat figures repeatedly; for example, recall the story with the wedding frock-coat, borrowed from Vyazemsky.

Here begin the dissimilarities — Samoilov's poet does not perish in a duel, his life story ends in another way. In addition to allusions to Pushkin, there are other allusions connected to different Russian poets and writers. The biography of the protagonist of "The Museum" becomes, in the end, a kind of invariant fate of the Russian writer.

"The Museum" can also be connected to the theme of Anna Akhmatova in Samoilov's poetry, much like, according to A. S. Nemzer [Немзер 2007: 159–160], the 1962 poem "Old Man Derzhavin" and the poem written

¹ In the beginning of the 1960s no doubt arose among scholars of the Romantic nature of Pushkin's first poem; other interpretations appeared much later. In it, the term "dashing" is encountered three times, and in the slightly later poem "The Robber Brothers" it appears twice; in much later verses it appears, understandably, in connection with the "national" theme or stylistics (see "On the statue playing knucklebones", "In the field of pure silver...", and "Delibash").

² See the memoir of Pushkin's appearance "in a red cotton shirt" at the Svyatogorsk fair, from the diary of petty bourgeois I. I. Lapin: "1825. On May 29 in the Holy Mountains at the ninth hour on Friday... here I had the pleasure to see Mr. Alexander Sergeevich Pushkin, who seemed in some way strange in his dress, and at first he was wearing a straw hat on his head, in a red cotton shirt, tied round with a light blue ribbon. In his hand he held an iron cane, and he wore very long black mutton chops, which looked more like a beard. He also had very long fingernails, with which he peeled oranges of which he ate, with great appetite, I think about half a dozen" [Пушкин в воспоминаниях: 517].

at Akhmatova's demise, "Death of a Poet". Nemzer referred to the work of R. D. Timenchik, who described the technique used to construct the image of the poet in "Poem without a Hero": "... the opposition of these archisemes, "poet-symbolist, poet-acmeist, poet-futurist", define a higher level archiseme: a "turn of the century poet", which, by coming into opposition with other archisemes that stand out in the depths of the same text, at last defines the archiseme of the "overall poet" or the "universal poet" [Тименчик: 280; see: Немзер 2006а: 380]. Samoilov used this "principle of juxtaposing different prototypes in his depiction of 'Old Man Derzhavin'" (in the title hero one sees not only Derzhavin, but also Akhmatova and Pasternak) and in composing "Death of a Poet", where Akhmatova and Pasternak are the prototypes behind the character of the poet [Немзер 2007: 159–160].

"The Museum" was written in 1961, earlier than the poems mentioned above, but "Poem without a Hero" was already known to Samoilov at that time. The archiseme of the universal poet in "The Museum" takes shape gradually: toward the end of the text the density of allusions to Pushkin decreases and references to the lives of other writers are introduced, as well as details that find no equivalents in Pushkin's biography. The quasi-Puskhin gradually transforms into a universal poet.

Let's return to the allusions to Pushkin in "The Museum". "The landscape 'Under the Cliff'" also recalls later iconography of Pushkin (see, for example, Aivazovsky's painting "Pushkin on the shore of the Black Sea" (1887), and "Pushkin in Crimea at the Georgian Cliffs" (1899), as well as the famous canvas by Aivazovsky and Repin "A. S. Pushkin's Farewell to the Sea" (1877)). In addition, a quotational reference to "Arion" is also connected to this theme: "And my damp robe / I dry in the sun under the cliff".

The poem "The Beginning of a message 'To my friend'" in Samoilov very likely refers to an entire genre-thematic complex related to Pushkin's creative work and to poetry as a whole at the beginning of the 19th century — the "epistle". This line, and the neighboring line "Here is the letter 'Clinging at your feet...' / Here is the answer: 'You are allowed to return...'" allow the reader to interpret this passage (in the context of the preceding subtexts and allusions to Pushkin) as a reference to a critical period in Pushkin's life, the mid-1820s: his non-participation in the speeches at Senate Square, the beginning of Nicholas' reign, his return from exile upon the personal order of the emperor, Pushkin's conversation with him, and the poems "In hope of glory and kindness..." and the later "To friends" ("No, I am no flatterer...").

The dissimilation noted above between the lives of the poet of "The Museum" and Pushkin here deepens further. It begins with the introduction of realities that are anachronistic to Pushkin's epoch³:

Вот поэта любимое блюдце,	Here is the poet's favorite saucer,
А вот это любимый стакан,	And here is his favorite glass,
Завитушки и пробы пера,	Flourishes and first attempts at writing,
Варианты поэмы «Ура!»	Variations of the poem "Hooray!" ⁴
И гравюра «Вручение медали».	And an etching of "Presentation of a medal".
Повидали? Отправимся далее.	Seen enough? Let us go on.

The glass and saucer are features of everyday life more appropriate to the 20th century than to the beginning of the 19th. Medals gain significance as an award only during the Soviet era; in the 19th century being granted an order was the highest award. Further on, the archaic backdrop of daily life is preserved, and even keeps a Pushkinesque tinge: "Flourishes and first attempts at writing" are memorable visual images of Pushkin's manuscripts.

The velvet blouse of the old poet is most likely associated with the dress of the Romantic artist, but does not contradict the overall picture. Daguerreotypes are a slightly later invention, appearing in Russia at the beginning of the 1840s. The appearance of the man printed in the daguerreotype — "bald, elderly, in a velvet blouse" — is reminiscent of textbook depictions of Tyutchev.

The poet of the second half of "The Museum" slightly resembles Pushkin. Specifically, his fate is a variation on the life of Pushkin, "if there hadn't been the Black River" (that is, if there hadn't been the last rebellion and rush toward freedom). Samoilov finishes writing the "ordinary destiny" of the poet that Pushkin predicted for Lensky. The poet's biography more and more resembles the model biography of a successful writer: after the poem "Hooray!" follows "Presentation of a medal", travels, personal attacks (apparently, from fellows of the guild) and responses to them, then the article "Why do we play the fool?" "Simple" rhetoric and plebian vocabulary are emphasized; here the rhetorical question with "we" might be associated by the reader with the forced and voluntary self-exposure of "oppositionists" of the 1930s. From this moment the

³ Compare to that which occurs with Pushkin in "Free verse" ("In three millennia...", 1973).

⁴ Possibly, this title, in light of previous ones, corresponds to Pushkin's poetic responses to the Polish uprising in the verses "To the Slanderers of Russia" and "The Anniversary of Borodino". Published in the brochure "At the Taking of Warsaw" (which also included Zhukovsky's "An Old Song on a New Fret"), these poems were received as their author's rejection of previously held freedom of opinion by not only the new generation, the student-proletarians (regarding this, see, for example: [Основа: 45–47]), but also by the poet's friends (compare to Vyazemsky's opinion).

life of the poet stops being interesting to the visitors of the museum: “Are you tired? We’re nearly done”.

The last developments in the biography seemingly represent a return to the true poetic path: the “laurel wreath” and “faded daguerreotype” of the poet, drawn with emphatically sympathetic details (that elicit affection): “bald, elderly, in a velvet blouse”. The last hemistich stanzas even hint at a tragic end: “That... daguerreotype... was the last. Then he died”. But the hint results in the quite prosaic beginning of the penultimate verse:

Здесь он умер. На том канapé ... Here he died. On that settee ...

The following lines return to the earlier poet, the author of “the ode ‘Down with!’” But this return is mediated by the ironic-parodic tone of the text as a whole and the incompleteness of the poet’s own words, introducing the theme of incomprehensibility:

Перед тем прошептал изречение	Just prior he whispered utterances
Непонятное: «Хочется пе...»	Incomprehensible: “I want ca...”
То ли песен? А то ли печенья?	A carol? Or candy?
Кто узнает, чего он хотел,	Who will ever know what he wanted,
Этот старый поэт перед гробом!	That old poet before his coffin!

Precisely in connection with the “twice-read last words of the poet” commentators have recalled the two variations of Lensky’s fate [Немзер, Тумаркин: 669]. The corresponding stanzas of “Eugene Onegin” (XXXVII–XXXIX of Chapter VI) are the subtext for Samoilov’s entire poem and, possibly, the inspiration for its plot. Wavering between ironic-parodic and tragic intonations, the poem also references the depictions of Lensky’s fates. The play on epigraphs (the clash of their meanings, stylistics and fictional sources) confirm the significance of the Pushkinesque poetic complex in the construction of “The Museum”.

The conclusion of Samiolov’s poem is, perhaps, just as pessimistic as the dual description of Lensky’s fate in “Onegin”. This pessimism is indicated by the comedic, reductive rhyme of “гробом — гардеробом” (“coffin” and “coatroom”):

Кто узнает, чего он хотел,	Who will ever know what he wanted,
Этот старый поэт перед гробом!	That old poet before his coffin!
Смерть поэта — последний раздел.	The death of the poet is the final act.
Не толпитесь перед гардеробом...	Don’t crowd the coatroom ...

The Lermontov’s “Death of a poet” quoted here sets an accusatory tone toward the museum’s visitors — they themselves are the “arrogant descendants”. After

the "death of the poet" his biography ends, blatantly contradicting the epigraph "from an old poet":

Потомков ропот восхищенный,	The descendants' murmur of admiration,
Блаженной славы Парфенон!	The Parthenon of blessed glory!

A "murmur of admiration" is not heard in the poem; on the contrary, the visitors' irritation is reflected: "Seen enough? Let us go on... Are you tired? We're nearly done... Don't crowd the coatroom". This parataxis, and the juxtaposition of the epigraph with the text, reveal another layer of the plot: the "Parthenon of blessed glory" turns out to be a boring museum, which the visitors abandon immediately after the "death of the poet". After this act there is nothing — no praise and no admiring descendants; thus the second epigraph, "it produces profound...", underscores the pessimistic version of the fate of the poet. Of the poet nothing remains but the parodic patter of the tour guide, behind which the author's voice can be discerned. In "The Museum" Samoilov has done a variation on the theme which occupies perhaps first place in his thoughts about poetry: the right of the artist to his own path and own vision of the world, the right to answer or not answer the call of modernity, and the ability to equate service to the Muses and a desire for privacy with worldly happiness.

A. S. Nemzer justly takes note of the "anti-domestic energy of the poem" [Немзер 2007: 161]. There is also a skeptical "anti-poetic" note worth pointing out. The author's voice in "The Museum" does not come through clearly, it is hidden behind the speech of the tour guide (and, it seems, there is no basis for fully equating the tour guide's speech with the voice of the author). The "vulgar voice" presents the old poet to the visitors/readers as a "lover of the quiet life", but his biography as following the path of gradual "reconciliation with reality" and "the rule of law". At first glance, the line "The departed / valued the quiet life", which is inconsistent with widespread notions about Pushkin, finds a parallel not only in the later biography of Pushkin (in his notions about privacy), but also in his poetic stories of an earlier era; for example, in these lines from "Onegin's Journey": "A housewife now is what I treasure; / I long for peace, for simple fare: / *Just cabbage soup and room to spare*". Here Samoilov demonstrates how one can draw out a single plot from the complex biography of a writer with many different potential plot lines, straightening the intention and defining the tendency (and Samoilov's irony is above all directed at just such an impoverished interpretation). Pushkin's biography in the context of Russian culture naturally became the first subject of similar interpretations; this explains the author's choice of Pushkin as the basis for the semantic structure of "The Museum".

The parody of the speech genre (the “museum of literary history”), of course, is a means of creating distance between the author and adherents of that genre. But the poet’s life story as presented through his own works — “the ode ‘Down with!’”, “The Beginning of a message ‘To my friend’”, the completed (judging by the answer) letter “Clinging at your feet...”, followed by the poem “Hooray!” and the article “Why do we play the fool?” — is beyond parody and truly shows “reconciliation with reality”. Following in the footsteps of predecessors in using the concept of the archiseme, one ventures to say that the juxtaposition of allusions to different prototypes in “The Museum” forms the archiseme of a “pseudo Pushkin”, a negative twin of the poet, whose biography is the inverse of the life story of a successful writer. As the plot progresses, the parodic vulgarity of the excursion through the apartment-museum acquires another rationale: the author of “Hooray!” and the article “Why do we play the fool?”, having earned his apartment museum, has also earned a diminished interpretation of his life and the bored inattention of the listeners. Behind the parody of the Pushkin museum lies the parody of the pseudo Pushkin. The political implications of this poem, possibly, conditioned its placement at the beginning of the collection and, moreover, determined the translation strategy employed by Jaan Kross.

Kross translated “The Museum” into Estonian in the 1960s, and the translation was published in the collection “Värsipõimik”⁵ in 1965. The poets themselves first became acquainted in the 1960s, in Moscow, and they continued to socialize thereafter in Tallinn. When Samoilov moved to Pärnu, Kross himself noted how their meetings became altogether rare: “Hiljem, kui temast sai pärnakas, oleme puutunud tegelikult üsna harva kokku” [PS: 6]. Thus, it is difficult to say whether the translations were fully “authorized”. However, the long acquaintance of the two poets and their mutual interest make authorization very likely.

In his translation of “The Museum”, Jaan Kross accents those archisemes that appeared in the original text while deemphasizing those particular allusions that would have held little meaning to the majority of Estonian readers. He strives for poetic preciseness, unwaveringly preserving the strophic division and rhyme scheme (which, in his own poetry, is uncharacteristic; on the whole, rhyme has an insignificant role in modern Estonian poetry).

Kross even translates the first epigraph in verse:

Käib järelopõlve harras melu,
kus au ja sära Parthenon...

⁵ Samoilov, D. *Maja-muuseum// Värsipõimik*. Tallinn, 1965. Lk 120–121.

The first stanza of the poem is translated fairly precisely, and Kross makes no reductions. The only change of note in the first stanza is the shortening of the phrase «Это штора — окно прикрывать» ("This is the curtain that covers the window") to "Aga see — tema aknaruloo" (the visual imagery of the phrase is nonetheless maintained). The reduction is made up for in the next line: "Lemmiktool. Siin ta istus ühtlugu" («Любимый стул. Здесь он часто сидел» — "His favorite chair. Here he often sat") instead of the original «Вот поэта любимое кресло» ("Here is the poet's favorite chair"). The addition of information not found in the original is motivated by the reduction in the previous line. The line of the translation is composed of two sentences of equivalent meaning (a "favorite chair" being one in which one often sits or uses). The redundancy of this line is the functional equivalent of Samoilov's "This is the curtain that covers the window" (covering a window is the one and only purpose of a curtain). By applying this technique to another object, Kross changes neither the plot, nor the intention of the original.

At the end of the first stanza, a pun is absent from the translation (as well as a pun rhyme): instead of «Покойный был ценителем жизни спокойной» ("The deceased valued a life of peace"), the translation is "Vaiksest elust ta pidas suurt lugu" ("He deeply respected the peaceful life"). The Estonian language does not have an appropriate synonym for "deceased" that would have lent itself to an equivalent play on words. But the punning rhyme is conveyed by Kross via the unusual rhymes of this first stanza: "see siin — kanapee siin, ühtlugu — suurt lugu"⁶. Composite rhyme is more frequently found in comedic poetry. Kross does not include the original pun, but he does utilize composite rhyme (in the first case, almost a redif), which creates an analogous effect of "unambiguous" word play (in the original, the pun is a part of the parodic speech of the tour guide).

In the second stanza of the translation Kross is less precise, but his departure from the original seems to be an intentional technique intended up to lay open the meaning of the poem to the Estonian reader, without any attempt to preserve the associations that would arise in the mind of a Russian reader.

The portrait as described in the translation lacks any sign of anonymity, but becomes "one of many" ("üks paljudest neist"). The addition of the poet's age in the translation ("Here the poet is fourteen years old" — "Siin poeedil on aastat viisteist") arises due to restrictions of meter ("neliteist" is longer by one syl-

⁶ It may be assumed that this rhyme is a phonetic allusion to the original rhymed pair of «Кауру — аруу». The translator did not preserve the toponym, but preserved its sound in another passage of the poem, a technique not often encountered in poetic translation.

lable). “The later portrait is dashing” is deprived of its adjective in translation: “Siin — üks hilisem pilt. Pole paha?” Instead of a particular characteristic, another address to the tourists is inserted, using an assertively conversational, familiar construction which becomes the stylistic equivalent of the skipped adjective.

Instead of to Kaluga, Kross sends his poet simply “to exile” (“maapakku”), making this section less specific, as the significance of exile to Kaluga would be totally unobvious to readers outside of Russian culture⁷.

Historical realities also become less definite. The “frock coat” Kross translates as “kuub”, which can mean frock coat, or dinner jacket, or caftan, or even “apparel”. The “frock-coat with a hole” of the original recalling first and foremost Pushkin’s own frock-coat and, accordingly, alluding to Pushkin’s life, in translation loses this connection. “An epistle to a friend” is translated simply as “A message” (“Läkitus”), while the “flourishes and first attempts at writing” become “a few leaves of squiggles/curls” (“kriksadulle paar lehte”).

In the fifth stanza, the translator transposes the order of two scenes:

Годы странствий. Венеция. Рим.	Years of pilgrimage. Venice. Rome.
Дневники. Замечанья. Тетрадки.	Diaries. Observations. Notebooks.
Вот блестящий ответ на нападки.	Here is his brilliant response to the attacks.
И статья «Почему мы дурим?»»	And the article “Why do we play the fool?”

Päevaraamatud. Siin — ülipeen
vastulöök tema labastajaile.
Rännuaastad, teed mitmeile maile
ning artikkel “Miks narrusi teen?”

In translation the “attackers” are concretized, becoming “labastajad” (“vulgarians”), but at the same time the geographical names and destinations of “pilgrimage” are removed (in place of Venice and Rome, there is “mitmed maad”). For Samoilov, the naming of cities is likely more symbolic than concrete; Venice and Rome are markers of high European culture. At the same time, it is significant that these cities metonymically indicate Italy, whence many Russian writers and artists in general went for inspiration. The translation lacks this symbolism, as well as the original poem’s contrast of Kaluga with Venice and Rome. Among all the geographical names, only Toulouse remains in the translation, a city which appears to have no symbolic or metonymic significance in the original poem.

⁷ Notably, people were not often exiled to Kaluga. Among well-known persons of Russian history, only Shamil and A. V. Lunacharsky were sent there.

It is of note that in Kross's translation the title of the poet's article is transformed: in place of the pronoun *we* there is *I*; this clarifies the "repentant" meaning of the title.

The translator diverges from the original most noticeably in the final stanzas of the poem. First, the contradiction disappears between "then he *was killed*. // Here he *died*. On that settee" («потом он *погиб*. // Здесь он *умер*. На том канаве»). Kross totally avoids using verbs and their corresponding semantics: "see pleekinud pilt ... temast viimaseks jäi. // Surisäng. Jah — siin see kanapee". The tension disappears between "was killed" ("the poet was killed" — see "Death of a Poet", below) and "died. On that settee", and with it the quotational reference is disrupted. "Death of a Poet" becomes just "death" ("Surm ongi viimane osakond").

The death of the protagonist in translation is more picturesque and less evaluative: it contains no oxymoronic "incomprehensible utterances"; rather, just before death the poet lifts his head slightly and whispers ("Enne seda siit kergitas pea ta / ja veel sosistas...").

The translation of this deathbed utterance must have been particularly troublesome for the translator, as it requires the matching of a most "common" anaphora with a most "poetic" one. Translation of the required repetition found in "песен — печенья" (translated above as "*carol — candy*") was impossible, so for this construction Kross uses an object he had inserted into the text earlier: instead of the poet's "favorite glass", the museum houses his "favorite tea glass" ("lemmik teeklaas"), with which he "moistens his tongue" ("keelekest kasta"). Instead of "печенья" ("cookies"), tea (tee) appears in the translation, and "песни" ("songs") are exchanged for "knowledge" (teada). "Knowledge" appeared, probably, as a result of a transfer; Kross moved the equivalent word from the tour guide's speech to the direct speech of the protagonist: "Who will ever know what he wanted", in translation becomes "Kes see *öelda võib*, mis ta just tahtis" ("Who *can say* what he wanted"); then, correspondingly, made replacements in the dialogue:

«Хочется пе...»	"I want ca..."
То ли песен? А то ли печенья?	A carol? Or candy?
"Tahaksin te—" —	
pole selge, kas "teed" või kas "teada"	

The last rhyme in Samoilov's poem, the lowering style rhyme of "гробом — гардеробом" ("coffin — coatroom"), is absent from the translation, and garde-roob (coatroom) moves to the beginning of the line. However, the reductive effect is transferred to the verb phrase of the last sentence. The museum visitors

in Samoilov “crowd” (“толпятся”) before the coatroom; in Kross they “run” to it (“Garderoob (ärge jookske!) on lahti”).

Of course, to draw conclusions about the translation tactics used by Kross based only on the examples above would be to take inexcusable liberties. The collection “Bottomless Moments”, its composition, and its poetics deserve holistic analysis and consistent interpretation. Furthermore, a broad authorial context is essential, as this would provide for the correlation of Kross’s translation practices with his own poetic works, thereby allowing a more precise determination of the significance of his translation techniques and evaluation of his direction and intentions in any deviations from the original text.

This article has attempted only to demonstrate that in translation, Kross, attempting to follow the original, transformed the text in order to reveal its potential meaning to his audience. Jaan Kross’s translation of David Samoilov’s “The Museum” lost its layer of allusion associated with Pushkin (due to the reduction of the number of historical and biographical associations, etc.), but thereby gained a broader meaning: no longer the biography of “the Russian poet” (presumably of the 19th century), but the biography of “the universal poet”.

Works Cited

Ашукин: *Ашукин Н. С. Живой Пушкин*. М., 1926.

Береговская: *Береговская Э. М. Самойлов-лирик: лингвостилистический аспект // Русский язык в научном освещении*. 2003. № 6 (2). С. 14–26.

Борский: *Борский Б. Иконография Пушкина до портретов Кипренского и Тропинина // Лит. наследство*. Т. 16–18 [А. С. Пушкин: Исследования и материалы]. М., 1934. С. 961–968.

Вересаев: *Вересаев В. Н. Пушкин в жизни: В 2 т.* М., 2001.

Немзер 2006: *Немзер А. С. Поэт после поэзии: самоидентификация Давида Самойлова // Блоковский сборник XVII: Русский модернизм и литература XX века*. Тарту, 2006. С. 150–174.

Немзер 2006а: *Немзер А. С. О четырех стихотворениях Давида Самойлова // Немзер А. С. Дневник читателя: русская литература в 2005 году*. М., 2006.

Немзер 2007: *Немзер А. С. Пушкин в стихотворении Давида Самойлова «Ночной гость» // Пушкинские чтения в Тарту 4: Пушкинская эпоха: Проблемы рефлексии и комментария*. Тарту, 2007.

Немзер, Тумаркин: *Немзер А. С., Тумаркин В. И. Примечания // Самойлов Давид. Стихотворения*. СПб., 2006.

Пушкин в воспоминаниях: *Вацуро В. Э., Гиллельсон М. И., Иезуитова Р. В., Левкович Я. А. Комментарии // Пушкин в воспоминаниях современников*. СПб., 1998. Т. 1.

Осват: *Осват А.* Смерть Пушкина, рождение интеллигенции (реплика по ходу дискуссии) // Россия/Russia. Новая серия / Под ред. Н. Г. Охотина. Вып. 2 [10]: Русская интеллигенция и западный интеллектуализм: История и типология. М., 1999.

Солженицын: *Солженицын А. И.* Давид Самойлов // Новый мир. 2003. № 6.

Тименчик: *Тименчик Р. Д.* Заметки о «Поэме без героя» // Ахматова А. Поэма без героя. М., 1989.

PS: *Самойлов Д., Кросс Я.* Põhjatud silmapilgud / Бездонные мгновенья. Таллинн, 1990.