

CANDIDATE NO.: 664744

ESSAY TITLE: Translation in Context: A Descriptive Account of *Romeo and Juliet* in Versions by Konstantin Bal'mont and Anna Radlova

MODULE & TERM: Dissertation, TT2020

WORD COUNT: 24,306

Translation in Context: A Descriptive Account of *Romeo and Juliet* in Versions by Konstantin Bal'mont and Anna Radlova

Contents

Introduction	2
Konstantin Bal'mont's 1919 version of <i>Romeo and Juliet</i>	11
Bal'mont's <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> : a case study	40
Bal'mont's <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> as a landmark translation	51
Anna Radlova's 1934 version of <i>Romeo and Juliet</i>	55
Radlova's <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> : a case study	79
Radlova's <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> as a landmark translation	103
Conclusion	110

Introduction

This thesis will analyse two translations of *Romeo and Juliet* completed in the early years of the Soviet Union: one produced by Konstantin Bal'mont in 1919, the other by Anna Radlova in 1934. The research will use the Descriptive Translation Studies framework, particularly Gideon Toury's idea of translation norms, in order to try to account for some of the choices made in both translations, as well as for the reception of these translations.

The texts that form the focus of this thesis have not yet received the scholarly attention they deserve. Konstantin Bal'mont's version of *Romeo and Juliet* was completed in 1919, having been commissioned for a 1921 stage production by Alexander Tairov's Kamerny Theatre in Moscow. However, it was ultimately rejected and replaced, and was never published as a standalone literary work. Having only been rediscovered by Bal'mont's relatives in 2011, the translation has received little critical attention, with only a single scholarly article, devoted to potential reasons for the translation's failure, having been published in 2019.¹ In the early 1930s, Anna Radlova also undertook a translation of *Romeo and Juliet*, for a 1934 production of the play by her husband Sergei Radlov, who was the artistic director of the Radlov Studio Theatre in Leningrad. The translation was used onstage again by Radlov in subsequent re-interpretations of the

¹ See E. Lutsenko, *Perevodcheskoe fiasko K. D. Bal'monta: Chernovaya redaktsiya "Romeo i Dzhul'etty" U. Shekspira*, *Shagi* 5(3) (2019), pp.84-102

play, with a new staging being introduced in 1939, and was also chosen for the seminal *Vil'yam Shekspir: Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, which was published by Academia between 1936 and 1949.² Radlov's productions of Radlova's translations seem to have been highly popular with the public,³ making their continued absence from literary criticism remarkable.

Indeed, the only research devoted solely to Radlova's translations of Shakespeare has been Warren's unpublished 2015 doctoral thesis, which concentrates on Radlova's translation of *Othello* and its various productions by Sergei Radlov.⁴

In addition to the absence of critical literature on these specific translations, analysing translations for the stage from a Descriptive perspective is a relatively new approach. Descriptive Translation Studies emerged as an alternative to the prescriptive approach to translation, based on the notion of 'equivalence'.⁵ It began to see translations as independent texts within complex systems and to describe translation choices in relation to these systems. In this way, the translation was considered as part of the target culture, and the translator could 'be said

² See G. Tihanov (ed.), *Gustav Shpet's Contribution to Philosophy and Cultural Theory* (Indiana, Purdue University Press: 2009), p. 71

³ See J. Warren, *Rewriting Othello for the Stalinist Stage: The Case of Sergei and Anna Radlov. Working Papers in the Humanities, MHRA 11* (2017), pp.17-29 (pp.17-18)

⁴ See J. Warren, *Acculturating Shakespeare: The Tactics of Translating His Works Under Stalin in the Light of Recent Theoretical Advances in Translation Studies*. (Unpublished PhD thesis: The University of Nottingham, 2015)

⁵ See G. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies – and beyond* (Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2012)

to operate first and foremost in the interest of the culture into which they are translating'.⁶ As Bassnett and Levefre explain:

Translations are never produced in an airlock where they, and their originals, can be checked against the *tertium comparationis* in the purest possible lexical chamber, untainted by power, time, or even the vagaries of culture. Rather, translations are made to respond to the demands of a culture, and of various groups within that culture.⁷

While Descriptive Translation Studies have been applied broadly to literary texts, and studies of drama translations have been growing in popularity since the 1960s,⁸ Descriptive Studies of translations for the stage only began to appear in the 1990s, with works such as Heylen's 1993 study of *Hamlet* in France.⁹ More recent examples include Ploix's 2020 exploration of the role of verse and rhyme in Molière translations for the English stage.¹⁰ Warren's study of Radlova's *Othello* is currently the only Descriptive study of an English play translated for the Russian stage. A similar analysis will be attempted here, with the translations of Bal'mont and Radlova examined in their specific theatrical and socio-cultural contexts. Approaching these two versions of *Romeo and Juliet* with a focus on explanation rather than evaluation will provide a range of

⁶ Toury, 2012: 6

⁷ See A. Lefevre and S. Bassnett (eds.), *Translation, History and Culture* (London: Pinter, 1990), p.7

⁸ See I. Ordóñez, Theatre Translation Studies: An overview of a burgeoning field (Part I: Up to the early 2000s). *Status Quaestionis*, 2(5) (2013), pp.90-129 (p.92)

⁹ See R. Heylen, *Translation, Poetics, and the Stage. Six French Hamlets* (London: Routledge, 2014)

¹⁰ See C. Ploix, *Translating Molière for the English-speaking Stage: The Role of Verse and Rhyme*. (London: Routledge, 2020)

insights, particularly due to highly divergent, yet interrelated, contexts in which they were completed. In order to most usefully evaluate the influence of these contexts, it will be necessary to choose aspects of the Descriptive method which are most relevant to both works as translations for the stage, as well as to each individual translation and its distinctive background.

Toury characterises his Descriptive approach as looking at the relationship between the function, process and product of a translation. It is 'the prospective function of the translation, via its required textual-linguistic make-up [...], which yields and governs the strategies which are resorted to during the production of the TL (target language) text in question, and hence the translation act as a whole.'¹¹ In order to understand the function of a translation, it is vital to identify the socio-cultural norms present during its production, since it is in relation to these norms that translation choices are made. As Toury explains, translation choices occur where 'the norms [of the target-language culture] intersect with the translator's liberties,' resulting in a balance between a translation's 'acceptability' in the target language culture and 'adequacy' as a representation of the original text.¹² This study will consider the major cultural and theatrical norms at play in the production of Bal'mont's and

¹¹ Toury, 2012: 6

¹² Toury, 2012: 68-69

Radlova's translations of *Romeo and Juliet*, and the extent to which the translators adhere to each of these norms in their translation choices.

In order to allow for as scientific a comparison of the translations' relationships between their functions, process and final product as possible, Descriptive Translation Studies require a high degree of comparability between the translations under consideration.¹³ The translations of *Romeo and Juliet* produced by Bal'mont and Radlova fulfil this requirement extremely well, being translations of the same text, into the same language and for the same purpose, namely for performance onstage. They were also both produced after the 1918 Revolution and were the only surviving translations of the play completed between 1918 and 1934. However, despite these shared characteristics, the translations were completed at two pivotal, and very dissimilar, moments in the early years of the Soviet Union. This period saw waves of cultural change, and both translations were completed at turning points in the development of the state's cultural policies. Bal'mont's was during the 'cultural Revolution' following the Bolshevik Revolution, while Radlova's was completed during the formative period of Socialist Realism, which was declared as a 'single 'artistic method' for literature and culture' in 1932.¹⁴

The combination of controlled and independent variables presented by these two translations is valuable when considering the effects of various

¹³ Toury, 2012: 5

¹⁴ See E. Dobrenko, 'Socialist Realism' in *The Cambridge Companion to Twentieth-Century Russian Literature*, Cambridge (eds. E. Dobrenko and M. Balina) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp.97-113

cultural norms and contexts on translation practice. This thesis will aim to compare some of these effects by exploring both the production and reception of the two translations. First, it will identify some of the cultural norms that were dominant during the production of each of the translations, in order to offer potential explanations for the translators' choices. This will involve looking into the background of the translators, as well as the immediate context in which they were working on the translation, including the commissioner of the translation and the purpose for which the translation was being commissioned. Following this, in order to understand more clearly why each of the translations received the reception it did, it will be necessary to examine the norms that were prevalent at the time of the translations' completion. This will take into account not only the overarching cultural atmosphere of the time, but, where possible, also the attitudes of critics and audiences.

Each of the translations under consideration in this study are located within extremely different contexts. As a result, in each case, norms based on the background of the translator and the cultural environment in which they were translating will be explored. Analysing Bal'mont's translation will require understanding his background as a Symbolist, as well as his relationship with Alexander Tairov. This will involve examining the translation in light of Bal'mont's own writings on foreign literature and drama; Symbolist translation theories; and Tairov's theatre practice before and after the Revolution. In Radlova's case, due to the lack of scholarship on Radlova's work, the study will look at the environment in

which she evolved as a poet and translator, and particularly at Sergei Radlov's theatre practice throughout the 1920s. In addition, the influence of Socialist Realist norms, which were gaining prominence in the early 1930s, will be taken into account. This contextual, Descriptive method is particularly applicable here because little is known about the specific details of how the two translations were produced. They largely exist as standalone works, unaccompanied by commentaries either by the translators themselves or by others. Indeed, in Radlova's case, very little academic research has been undertaken on any aspect of her life or work. However, the Descriptive approach bypasses and, in fact, thrives on this absence of direct commentary and evaluation. Instead, it builds a broader contextual framework around the translations and allows for the reasons behind the translators' choices to be tentatively reconstructed.

This thesis argues that, in both cases, the translations were the products of the translators' adherence to certain aesthetic and cultural norms. Bal'mont's translation choices seem to stem from his background as a Symbolist and his collaboration with Tairov, who in the early 1910s formed a synthetic theory of theatre in response to both Naturalism and Symbolism. Radlova's translation, meanwhile, was influenced largely by the changes that took place over the decade between the Revolution and the inauguration of Socialist Realism. Having only begun to undertake translation work during this period, Radlova's work may have been particularly susceptible to the aesthetic approaches being developed at the time, and adept at incorporating them into her work.

It also becomes clear that the reception of the translations was influenced in each case by whether the dominant translation and theatre norms changed over the period when the translation was being written. Although both translations were to be staged during periods of cultural change, the consequences of this were markedly different for each translator. In Bal'mont's case, the Revolution produced an entirely new set of translation and theatre norms, as expressed by Tairov in his writings and embodied in his productions. Bal'mont's translation was produced at the very end of the Neo-Realist period, as this school of thought was falling into obscurity. As a synthesis of Realism and Symbolism, Neo-Realism was retrospective, and was being overtaken by a rush to produce a new thesis fit for a Revolutionary epoch in Russia's cultural history. In Radlova's case, on the other hand, the cultural upheaval of the 1930s was in part born out of the developing theatre and translation norms of the preceding decade. Radlova's translation was informed by norms that were only gaining strength by the time her translation was completed. It was part of the new 'thesis' which had taken over from Tairov's 'synthesis' of Neo-Realism. In this way, Radlova's ability to achieve continuity between norms, and Bal'mont's failure to do so, arguably informed the reception and future of each text.

Finally, this explanation of the divergent fate of the two translations will be extended to the fact that Bal'mont and Radlova undertook the translation of *Romeo and Juliet* at a certain point in their careers; Bal'mont was an established translator, while Radlova was only beginning

her translation career. Bal'mont's translation could be seen as a summation of his life's work as a theatrical translator and collaborator of Tairov, bringing with it decades of artistic and aesthetic evolution. In contrast, Radlova's version of the play was produced during the formative, malleable phase of her career as a translator. This was perhaps intensified by the fact that Radlova's first years as a poet and translator coincided with the start of a new era, in a period of innovation and cultural rejuvenation. Radlova's youthful engagement with theatre in the first decade following the Revolution, and her blossoming as a translator in the first years of Socialist Realism, may have allowed her to accept more readily emergent norms and, therefore, to produce a highly acceptable translation of *Romeo and Juliet*. Bal'mont's work, meanwhile, was taking place towards the end of a cultural era in which he had been a leader, which perhaps played a role in the translation being perceived by some as stale and outdated. In this way, it is proposed that not only the translation choices, but also the reception of both translations were inevitable consequences of each translator being located in a specific place and time, and at a specific moment in their career, when they chose to undertake their translations of *Romeo and Juliet*.

Konstantin Bal'mont's 1919 version of *Romeo and Juliet*

In order to analyse Bal'mont's translation of *Romeo and Juliet* from the perspective of Descriptive Translation Studies, it is necessary to identify the main cultural and translation norms that were at play during his translation process. Arguably, the major influences on Bal'mont's work were his being a Symbolist poet and translator, and his work as a translator for the stage, specifically for Alexander Tairov's Kamerny Theatre.

First and foremost, Bal'mont was a Symbolist poet and translator, and his translations were undoubtedly as important a part of his creative output as his poetry.¹⁵ It is therefore important to consider the ways in which Symbolist theories may have influenced the choices he made when translating *Romeo and Juliet*. In addition, this study is concerned with Bal'mont's translation only as a translation for the stage. Not only was the translation explicitly intended for the stage, but it was also never published as a text, having only been discovered in its unpublished form in 2011.¹⁶ As a result, the translation will be analysed in terms of its intended and limited function as the script for Alexander Tairov's 1921 production of *Romeo and Juliet* on the stage of Tairov's Kamerny Theatre in Moscow.

¹⁵ See A. Pyman, 'Russian Symbolism acquires a name. Bal'mont, Briusov, Dobroliubov and Konevskoi (1894–1900)' in *A History of Russian Symbolism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp.56-90 (p.59)

¹⁶ Lutsenko, 2019

These major cultural contexts within which Bal'mont was operating will inform the materials used in the analysis of Bal'mont's translation. First, the influence of Symbolist thought on the translation will be inferred largely through the words of Bal'mont himself. Bal'mont's poetry embodies his Symbolist priorities, while many of his essays convey his attitude toward foreign authors, including Shakespeare. This will be supplemented by a survey of Symbolist ideas more broadly, particularly the Symbolist approach to translation. Secondly, Bal'mont's translation will be placed in the context of Tairov's theatre practice. Bal'mont's role as a translator for Tairov's productions began with the theatre's opening production, *Sakuntala*, in December 1914.¹⁷ This makes Tairov's developing view of his Kamerny Theatre, from its inception in 1914 until 1919, central to understanding the role of Bal'mont's translation and the way in which this may have influenced his translation choices. Particularly useful will be an exploration of Tairov's Neo-Realist phase, which lasted from 1914 until the Revolution, as well as his gradual shift to 'Concrete Realism' after 1917. In order to gain a sense of the extent to which Bal'mont shared Tairov's vision of the theatre, this study will examine Bal'mont's own writings about the theatre alongside Tairov's numerous essays on theatre theory and the articles in which he explains his aims in each production.

¹⁷ See Yu. Golovashenko, 'Kratkaya letopis' zhizni i tvorchestva' in Tairov, A., *O teatre* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshestvo, 1970a), pp.505-535 (p.509)

Following an exploration of the context in which Bal'mont's translation was completed, a case study will exemplify the influence of certain norms on the work. It will be argued that Bal'mont's translation choices incorporated the individualism of Symbolist poetry, as well as the prioritisation of form inherent in both Symbolist poetry and translation. In addition, Bal'mont's translation clearly adhered to the norms of Tairov's Neo-Realism, whose principles regarding speech and music in the theatre Bal'mont shared. This blend of norms seems to have led to a harmonious working relationship between Bal'mont and Tairov until the Revolution. However, by the time of the *Romeo and Juliet* production, the dynamic had changed, with the Revolution sparking a new period of experimentation in the theatre and in the arts more broadly. By 1921, and even before this, Tairov had clearly responded to this change, and was aiming to adapt his theatre practice to the country's revolutionary atmosphere. *Romeo and Juliet* was Tairov's first dramatic production to take place in this period and reflects Tairov's shift in perspective. Bal'mont's translation, meanwhile, as a product of pre-Revolutionary Symbolist norms to which he remained faithful throughout his career, was incompatible with this new era. This is most explicitly demonstrated by the fact that the translation was ultimately rejected by Tairov, and Bal'mont never collaborated with Tairov again.

Symbolist poetry and translation

Individualism

As a leader of the first generation of Russian Symbolists, Bal'mont was a member of the first literary and artistic grouping to move away from the Realism and positivism which had dominated nineteenth-century art and literature. Around the turn of the century, Symbolists such as Merezhkovsky, Briusov, Bely and Ivanov published essays putting forward a view on art in which individuality, intuition, inspiration and 'the unknown' formed the key ingredients of artistic creation.¹⁸ Bal'mont's philosophy was in keeping with those of his fellow Symbolists, as can be seen from his four lectures on Russian literature delivered at the University of Oxford in 1897. In these lectures, he too focuses on the role of the individual in poetry, a form of art which he viewed as taking 'its content primarily from the infinite inner world of the individual'.¹⁹ Moreover, Bal'mont's individualism permeates his original poetry. For example, his 1900 collection *Горящие здания* is explicitly subtitled 'Лирика современной души' and includes cycles such as 'Совесть' in which he explores deeply personal themes. Its fourth poem, 'Рассвет', for instance, details a period which is recognisable as the turbulent 'bohemian Künstlerleben' of Bal'mont's early poetic career.²⁰ It describes

¹⁸ See E. Dobrenko, *Aesthetics of Alienation: Reassessment of Early Soviet Cultural Theories* (trans. J. Savage) (Northwestern University Press: Evanston, 2005), pp.11-13

¹⁹ See E. Metz, Konstantin Bal'mont's Oxford Lectures on Russian "Fin de Siècle" Poetry: Publication, Introduction and Comments. *Slavonic and East European Review*, 87(1), (2009), pp.78-99

²⁰ Pyman, 1994: 59

the 'прозябанье / В позорном полусне' in which the poet 'искал мечты в вине,' and at the end of the poem, Bal'mont is left with the sense that 'больше нет возврата/ К тому, чем прежде был.'²¹

Bal'mont also comments on his appreciation for Romantic, individualistic poetry in several of his essays. In his seminal 'Чувство личности в поэзии', for instance, he shows his admiration for the Elizabethan period of English literature and the Golden Age of Spanish literature, when poets

пели каждый для себя, и все же, как волны, создавали хор, выразили в звуках и образах все, что было существенного в родной народности, и, бесстрашно прикасаясь к самому интимному, говорили обо всем с такой свободой и с таким самозабвением, как будто кроме говорящего не было никого другого в мире.²²

He sees Calderon, in particular, with his 'драма личности'²³ as a precursor of the Symbolist movement, and highlights the individualistic spirit of both Calderon and Shakespeare: 'историческая атмосфера, в смысле воздействия на личность, была полна как в Англии, так и в Испании, однородных элементов: национального могущества, индивидуального блеска, и грез о всемирном господстве.'²⁴

²¹ See K. Bal'mont, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomach* (vol.1) (Moscow: Knigovek, 2010), pp.239-249

²² See K. Bal'mont, 'Чувство личности в поэзии' in *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomach* (vol.6) (Moscow: Knigovek, 2010a), pp.289-303 (p. 291)

²³ See K. Bal'mont, 'Kal'deronovskaya drama lichnosti' in *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomach* (vol.6) (Moscow: Knigovek, 2010b), pp.304-320

²⁴ See K. Bal'mont, 'Elementarnye slova o simvolisticheskoi poesii' in *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomach* (vol.6) (Moscow: Knigovek, 2010d), pp.348-368 (p.349)

This conception of Symbolism, which promoted the individual and the intuitive, can be linked to Bal'mont's heightened interest in English Romantic literature, with which he engaged from his youth. Not only did Bal'mont find himself naturally drawn to English poets and playwrights as inspiration for his own work, but, from a more self-conscious perspective, he also saw these writers as important figures in the development of Russian literature and Russian Symbolism. In an essay entitled 'О русских поэтах,' Bal'mont refers to English-language writers such as the English Romantics, Dickens and Byron as figures 'с которыми неразрывно связана моя первая юность, а также и более поздние годы, годы сознательной духовной жизни.'²⁵

This was part of a broader and deeper connection that Bal'mont sensed between English and Russian literature, since, in his view, English-language literature 'касается самых заветных и тонких струн русской души.'²⁶ Bal'mont compares Gogol to Swift, Dickens; Pushkin to Byron; and Dostoevsky to Dickens and Poe.²⁷ Particularly strong is the connection between English-language literature and Symbolism. For Bal'mont, some of the greatest Symbolist works of the nineteenth century were written by the English and Americans, including Blake, Shelley, De Quincy, Rosetti, Tennyson, Swinburne, Wilde, Poe and Whitman.²⁸ This undoubtedly informed Bal'mont's choice from the early 1890s to undertake translations

²⁵ See K. Bal'mont, 'О russkikh poetakh' in *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomach* (vol.6) (Moscow: Knigovek, 2010c), pp.332-347 (p. 333)

²⁶ Bal'mont, 2010c: 333

²⁷ Bal'mont, 2010c: 334

²⁸ Bal'mont, 2010d: 352

of English Romantic poets such as Blake and Shelley, and of English dramatists including Marlowe, Shakespeare, Shelley and Wilde.

Bal'mont's reverence for Shakespeare in particular is apparent from the three dedications he wrote in honour of the 300th anniversary of the bard's death. These were published as part of a 1916 English literary anthology, *A Homage to Shakespeare*, alongside contributions by such figures as A. C. Bradley, pointing to Bal'mont's status at the time as an authority on Shakespeare. In 'Гений видящего сердца,' the first of these three dedications, Bal'mont explores the Russian affinity for Shakespeare, claiming, for instance, that Shakespeare's language speaks to people of all nations, but to Russians 'most of all'.²⁹ He goes on to declare a more general compatibility between England and Russia through invoking the words of Shelley – 'meek and bold' – which he uses to characterise the 'poetic temperament' of both countries.³⁰ This perhaps indicates that Bal'mont saw a continuity between Shakespeare and the English Romantics, which may suggest that Bal'mont took a similar approach to his translations of the two areas of English literature, namely producing highly individualistic, intuitive renditions of the English. This is supported by some of the critical reviews of Bal'mont's translation of Shakespeare. For instance, Vadim Shershenevich, whose own translation of *Romeo and Juliet* would come to replace Bal'mont's in Tairov's production, criticised

²⁹ See K. Bal'mont, 'Genii vidyashevo serdtsa' in *A Homage to Shakespeare* (ed. I. Gollancz) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1916), loc.7658

³⁰ Bal'mont: 1916, loc.7678

Bal'mont's translation style for the alleged flaw of modifying the original work in an unnecessary and periphrastic way, whether it was Shelley, Whitman or Shakespeare:

Если Бальмонт был всегда мне чужд как поэт, то как переводчик он был невыносим <...> Каждый перевод Бальмонта — это вольное переливание воды из пустого в порожнее. Отпадает и замысел, и форма подлинника. Так было с Шелли, с Уитменом, с Гауптманом. То же стало и с Шекспиром.³¹

While Bal'mont was undoubtedly individualistic in his approach to translation, Shershenevich's view that the meaning and form of Shakespeare's original play are lost in Bal'mont's translation is unfounded, as will be demonstrated in the following discussion.

Poetic form in translation

While admiring the individualism of Shakespeare and the Romantics, and emulating this in his own translations of their work, Bal'mont was clearly also influenced by the formal experimentation of English and American writers such as Shelley and Poe.³² This manifested itself in Bal'mont's translation practice in his desire to remain as close as possible to the form of the original text, as was characteristic of many Symbolist translators.

³¹ See Shershenevich in Lutsenko, 2019: 89

³² Pyman, 1994: 59

One of the foremost Symbolist theorists of literary translation was Valery Briusov, a fellow Moscow Symbolist who worked closely with Bal'mont until their aesthetic split in the mid-1910s and who encouraged Bal'mont's early translations for Tairov's Kamerny Theatre.³³ For Briusov, translation was to be carried out with the aim of transposing the timelessness of the original text to the host language. The aim was to 'replace the original for the Russian reader,'³⁴ giving Russian speakers the experience of reading a foreign text in a foreign language while understanding it. Thus, translation was not to be made 'easy' or adapted for the short-term linguistic preferences of the contemporary audience and would most likely retain features that would be 'alien to the Russian reader,'³⁵ but would therefore be timeless in their 'alienness.' Bal'mont seems to have shared this approach, explicitly writing to his wife that he hoped his translation of *Romeo and Juliet* would remain in Russian literature for centuries: 'Шекспиром я, верно, буду занят весь этот год. Мне хочется сделать нечто крупное, что останется в русской литературе и русском театре надолго, на столетия'.³⁶

This aim of rendering the original text as literally as possible, in order to ensure its timelessness, led to a reverence for form, particularly in poetry.

³³ Sundaram, 2011

³⁴ See V. Briusov, 'On the Translation of Virgil's Aeneid' (1920) in Baer and Olshanskaya, (eds.), *Russian writers on translation: An anthology*. (Routledge: London and New York, 2013), pp.71-73 (p.72)

³⁵ See V. Briusov, 'A Few Reflection on Translating Horace's Odes into Russian Verse' (1916) in Baer and Olshanskaya, (eds.), *Russian writers on translation: An anthology*. (Routledge, London and New York: 2013), pp.69-71 (p.70)

³⁶ See E. Andreeva-Bal'mont, *Vospominaniya* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo imeni Sabashnikovykh, 1997), p.145

Briusov notes this in his discussion of Virgil, claiming that 'nowhere is form so intricately tied to content as in the works of classical writers, especially poets.'³⁷ Nikolai Gumilev, an Acmeist who had nonetheless been influenced by Symbolism,³⁸ concurred with Briusov's prioritisation of form, stressing the potential for formal modification to change the tone of the original poem. He went as far as to give his translator-readers 'Commandments' which 'are just as crucial as those of Moses, and yet I hope they will be more readily observed': 'every translator should leave unchanged: 1) number of lines, 2) metre and measure, 3) alternation of rhymes, 4) enjambment, 5) the type of rhymes, 6) the style of the vocabulary, 7) types of comparisons, 8) distinctive devices, and 9) shifts in tone.'³⁹

Bal'mont seems to have undertaken translation using a hybrid approach, preferring a non-literal, 'free' style which was steered by inspiration and a sense of individualism,⁴⁰ while maintaining a deep respect for formal accuracy. It could be argued that Bal'mont's approach was a manifestation of his Symbolist philosophy, rooted in the English poetry of both the Romantic period and the nineteenth century. This is shown by the way in which it simultaneously prioritises the personal inspiration of the author and the original work's musicality and form.

³⁷ Briusov, 1920: 72

³⁸ See S. Driver, Acmeism. *The Slavic and East European Journal*, 12(2) (1968), 141-156 (p.144)

³⁹ See N. Gumilev, 'Poetic Translations' (1919) in Baer and Olshanskaya, (eds.), *Russian writers on translation: An anthology*. (Routledge: London and New York, 2013), pp.95-98 (p.97)

⁴⁰ Lutsenko, 2019: 86

As will be explored in the second half of this section, Bal'mont's version of *Romeo and Juliet* serves to illustrate this translation method. On the one hand, Bal'mont remains intensely faithful to Shakespeare's meter and formal effects. On the other, he is translating the work of a dramatist from whom he saw the English Romantics – and, in turn, the Russian Symbolists – developing. As such, while maintaining proximity to the words and form of the original text, he continues to use Romantic – and Symbolist – techniques in the translation, including elevated and idiosyncratic language. This middle ground between the individualism of Symbolist poetry and the literalness of Symbolist translation arguably made Bal'mont the perfect translator for Tairov, with whose 'Neo-Realism' this approach corresponded.

Tairov's Kamerny Theatre

Bal'mont translated three plays for Tairov's Kamerny Theatre: Kalidasa's *Sakuntala*, which was staged in December 1914 as the theatre's first production; Wilde's *Salome*, which premiered in October 1917; and Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, which was intended for Tairov's May 1921 production. In the following exploration of Tairov's theatre practice as it evolved between 1914 and 1921, Tairov's principles will be compared with Bal'mont's, demonstrating the initial compatibility of their views on theatre. It will also show, however, that by 1921, when *Romeo and Juliet* was staged, their common theoretical outlook seems to have fractured. While Bal'mont and his version of *Romeo and Juliet* remained subject to pre-Revolutionary norms, Tairov had adjusted his outlook and his theatre practice in response to the Revolution.

Symbolist origins of Neo-Realism

The idea of a 'New Drama' was a popular discussion topic among cultural figures at the turn of the century, when the Symbolist movement had started to rail against the Realism that had dominated the arts in the nineteenth century.⁴¹ In theatre, Realism had taken the form of Naturalism, the attempt to re-create everyday life onstage, which became

⁴¹ See M. Green (ed.) *The Russian Symbolist Theatre: An Anthology of Plays and Critical Texts*. (Michigan: Ardis, 1986), p.14

famous through the productions of Stanislavsky at the Moscow Art Theatre. While this kind of theatre was popular with audiences, Naturalism was seen by the Symbolists as a manifestation of European theatre's decline, which could only be rectified by returning to non-Naturalistic theatre forms of the past.⁴²

Briusov was particularly vocal in rejecting Naturalism, for instance in his 1902 article 'Against Naturalism in the Theatre'. In the essay, he describes the Moscow Art Theatre as 'on a false path'⁴³ and invalidates its Naturalistic attempts at verisimilitude, asserting that 'to reproduce life faithfully on the stage is impossible. The stage is conventional by its very nature.'⁴⁴ In fact, for Briusov, the closer a piece of art is to reality, the less convincing it is, and the less it is perceived as artistic.⁴⁵ He calls, therefore, for a rolling back of imitation in favour of stylisation and clarity, as in the tradition of ancient theatre. This would include the work of playwrights, whose job it is to 'make it possible for the actor to express the physical in the spiritual', since 'plays are only forms into which the actors pour their own content.'⁴⁶

Bal'mont also expressed concerns with Naturalism, even many years after his work with Tairov, for example in his essay 'Слово о Калидасе', in which he sees Naturalistic and realistic theatre as failing to fulfil theatre's

⁴² Briusov, V. 'Against Naturalism in the Theatre' (1902) in Green, M., ed., *The Russian Symbolist Theatre: An Anthology of Plays and Critical Texts*. (Michigan: Ardis, 1986), pp.24-31 (p.24)

⁴³ Briusov, 1902: 25

⁴⁴ Briusov, 1902: 26

⁴⁵ Briusov, 1902: 27-28

⁴⁶ Briusov, 1902: 29

role of celebrating and improving humanity. Bal'mont, in his envisioned 'Theatre of Youth and Beauty', foresees a movement away from the Naturalism which he felt was propagated by 'грузными нашими бытовиками, низводящими театр до убогого цепляния за скучную изжитую вещественность.'⁴⁷ He echoes Briusov's calls for a return to the harmonious theatre of Ancient Greece, citing Shelley's admiration for the poetry and multi-disciplinary nature of Ancient Greek drama, which

собирает самые блестящие лучи человеческой природы, разделяет их и воспроизводит из простоты этих первичных форм, налагает на них печать величия и красоты, умножает все, что оно отражает, и одаряет эти отражения способностью распространять свое подобие всюду, куда они только упадут.⁴⁸

It is Ancient Indian theatre, however, that Bal'mont touts as the ultimate model, due to the way in which it shows that 'пути души и пути мечты богаче и красивее, чем упорное пребывание в низинах жизни, среди грубости и малого демонизма'. For Bal'mont, the works of Kalidasa, particularly *Sakuntala*, achieve this in their 'олицетворение[...] сложности в единстве'.⁴⁹

On a practical level, it was Vsevolod Meyerhold's stylised ('uslovnye') productions that most explicitly adopted the Symbolist philosophy and brought new Symbolist dramas to the stage from the early 1900s until

⁴⁷ See K. Bal'mont, 'Slovo o Kalidase' in *Izbrannoe: Stukhotvoreniya. Perevody. Stat'i*. (Moscow: Pravda, 1990).

⁴⁸ Bal'mont, 1990

⁴⁹ Bal'mont, 1990

the mid-1910s, when Symbolism began to wane as a movement.⁵⁰

However, the ideas of the Symbolists also formed the basis of the work of Tairov, whose personal search for a New Theatre led him to reject the extremes of both Naturalistic Theatre and the Theatre of Convention. On the one hand, like the Symbolists, he believed that Naturalism was both undesirable and unattainable.⁵¹ On the other, he saw Meyerhold's extreme use of stylisation and convention as superficial, flattening the onstage action and detracting from the all-important actor's craft.⁵²

Naturalism was misguided in its attempt to remove formal conventions from its reality, while Conventional theatre was misguided in its attempt to remove reality from its formal conventions. Tairov's Kamerny Theatre, and his so-called 'Neo-Realism,' offered a synthesis of the two extremes by reconciling formal experimentation with the creation of a new kind of 'reality' onstage.⁵³

This Neo-Realism was not only to be found in theatre, but in the arts more broadly. For instance, Evgeny Zamyatin's Synthetism has been described as Neo-Realism in its bringing together of Realism and Symbolism.⁵⁴ In his 1922 essay 'О синтетизме', Zamyatin describes his 'synthetism', the school of the Neo-Realists, as one of the three schools of

⁵⁰ Green, 1986: 15

⁵¹ See A. Tairov, 'Pro Domo Sua' in *O teatre (Zapiski rezhisyera)* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshestvo, 1970), pp.77-106 (p.82)

⁵² See A. Tairov, 'Stsenicheskaya atmosfera' in *O teatre (Zapiski rezhisyera)* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshestvo, 1970c), pp.157-173 (p.159)

⁵³ Tairov, 1970c

⁵⁴ See O. Tolmacheva, *Khudozhestvennaya sistema E I Zamyatina: k voprosu ob universal'nosti. Vestnik Tambovskogo universiteta. Seriya: Gumanitarnye nauki. 2* (2012)

art: thesis, count-argument, and synthesis, which is the counter-counter-argument ('утверждение; отрицание; и синтез -- отрицание отрицания').⁵⁵ The Neo-Realists had their roots in Realism while appreciating the heights of Symbolism – they 'спустились на землю, вернулись к родной почве, но сохранили «взгляд сверху», который дает им всеохватность, дальноркость и необходимую критичность в отображении реальности'.⁵⁶ As it was for Tairov, the power of the return to earth for Zamyatin was its fresh perspective, as a result of which 'только еще иступленной поцелуи, еще пьянее любовь, еще ярче краски, еще острее глаза, выхватывающие самую секундную суть линий и форм.'⁵⁷

The correspondence not only between Zamyatin and Tairov but between Zamyatin and Bal'mont is clear from Zamyatin's inclusion of Whitman among the 'Neo-Realists'.⁵⁸ Bal'mont, too, in an essay dedicated to Whitman, celebrates the poet's engagement with both heaven and earth: 'Он слил воедино элемент литературный, политический, религиозный, с элементом чисто-жизненной действительности, глубокая душа соединилась здесь с красивым сильным телом, бесстрашие мысли с бесстрашием действия'.⁵⁹ In this way, Zamyatin serves to embody the connection between the Neo-Realist philosophy of Tairov and the implicit

⁵⁵ See E. Zamyatin, 'O sintetizme' in *Sochineniya* (Moscow: Kniga, 1988)

⁵⁶ Tolmacheva, 2012: 121

⁵⁷ Zamyatin, 1988

⁵⁸ Zamyatin, 1988

⁵⁹ See K. Bal'mont, 'Pevets lichnosti i zhizni' in *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomach* (vol.6) (Moscow: Knigovok, 2010e), pp.519-535 (pp.521-522)

Neo-Realist version of Symbolism that Bal'mont admired. The following section will further demonstrate how Bal'mont's vision for the future of theatre often coincided with Tairov's theatre theory and practice.

Pre-Revolutionary Neo-Realist Theatre

On a practical level, Tairov's priority as a Neo-Realist theatre director was the 'theatricalisation of theatre',⁶⁰ whereby the actor would use a playwright's dramatic material to craft a unique onstage 'reality'. Tairov described how Neo-Realism 'создается реальным искусством актера в реальной (в пределах театральной правды) сценической атмосфере'.⁶¹ Importantly, this reality was to be achieved by means of the actor's skill and was not inherent to, or dependent on, the dramatic text itself.

Theatre was not a secondary function of literature but an independent art form, and any written drama would need to be fully reconceived when being transposed onto the stage.⁶² Tairov's view was that 'произведение драматическое даже такого гения, как Шекспир, — не есть еще произведение театральное.'⁶³

⁶⁰ See A. Tairov, 'Zritel'' in *O teatre (Zapiski rezhisyera)* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshestvo, 1970d), pp.181-192 (p.188)

⁶¹ See A. Tairov, 'Stsenicheskaya atmosfera' in *O teatre (Zapiski rezhisyera)* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshestvo, 1970c), pp.157-173 (p.166)

⁶² See G. Aronson, The Tragedy of the Cosmopolite Tairov. *The Russian Review*, 11(3) (July 1952) pp.148-156 (p.150)

⁶³ See A. Tairov, "'Romeo i Dzhul'etta'" (1921) in *O teatre (Rezhisyerskie eksplikatsii)* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshestvo, 1970), pp.284-291 (p.286)

In facilitating the creation of this actor-centric stage reality, Tairov would aim to reject the reconstruction of everyday life while at the same time celebrating its potential, producing a 'жизнеутверждение, утверждение радости жизни как таковой, несмотря на то, что делается в реальной действительности данного периода.'⁶⁴ This sense of Romantic Humanism can also be found in Bal'mont's vision of an ideal theatre, which he saw as inspiring activity and positivity. Unlike Naturalistic theatre, which was for Bal'mont a 'низкое ущемление человеческой души, [...] недостойное замедление [...] истинно человеческого существования',⁶⁵ theatre ought to entice the audience. Human vice, while being reflected onstage, was to remain in the background of the mirror or should be represented in such a way that it 'пугало ее, но также и обогащало свою страшную тайной'.⁶⁶

Tairov's simultaneous 'ниспровержение форм и норм действительности, существовавшей [...] в это время'⁶⁷ and triumphant espousal of human potential led to the Kamerny Theatre engaging predominantly with '«крайним[и]» жанрам[и]',⁶⁸ particularly tragedy – which Tairov saw as opposing petty feelings and quotidian concerns – and harlequinade – with its innovation and exuberance.⁶⁹ Within these genres, the specific pathos of each production's onstage reality would be expressed through every art

⁶⁴ See A. Tairov, 'Lektsii: 2 yanvarya 1931 g.' in *O teatre (Ob iskusstve teatra)* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshestvo, 1970e), pp.195-208 (p.199)

⁶⁵ Bal'mont, 1990

⁶⁶ Bal'mont, 1990

⁶⁷ Tairov, 1970e: 198

⁶⁸ Golovashenko, 1970: 45

⁶⁹ Markov, P. 'O Tairove' in Tairov, A. Y., *Zapiski rezhisyera* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshestvo, 1970), pp.9-41 (p.17)

form, 'музыка, свет, краски, динамизм сценической атмосферы, находящийся во взаимосвязи с динамикой развивающихся сценических актерских образов'.⁷⁰ This idea of a *Gesamtkunstwerk* was also central to Symbolist thought, and was one of the driving forces behind Symbolist drama production, due to theatre's ability to act as a 'meeting place of the arts'.⁷¹

Music was a particularly important element of this multimedia approach to theatre for both Tairov as a Neo-Realist and for Bal'mont as a Symbolist. For both, music was an artform to which other artforms ought to aspire. For example, Tairov was preoccupied with the idea of a 'rhythm' flowing through each of his productions, which he saw as rooted in music and, specifically, in the musicality of the dramatic text. It was music and 'магия ее ритмов' that 'помогла нам пережить сладостный процесс зарождения сценического синтеза, ощутить в себе первое робкое биение эмоциональной формы'.⁷² He often constructed 'сценическое актерское действие [...] по законам музыкальной драматургии, по законам музыкального искусства'⁷³ and, in order to achieve this, in Tairov's view, the poet was indispensable. It was the poet alone who was able to 'облечь речь актера в нужный ритмический рисунок и придать ей завершенную художественную форму'.⁷⁴

⁷⁰ Tairov, 1970e: 204

⁷¹ Green, 1986: 17

⁷² Tairov, 1970: 92

⁷³ Golovashenko, 1970: 64

⁷⁴ Tairov, 170a: 150

Bal'mont clearly shared these ideas, whether in regard to poetry, translation or theatre. As has already been mentioned, expressiveness through form and rhythm were central to Symbolist poetry, whether original or in translation,⁷⁵ and music, as an embodiment of form's triumph over content, was the artistic ideal of the Symbolists.⁷⁶ Indeed, Alexander Blok described the fragmentation of European culture, to which he was reacting, as a loss of 'musicality'.⁷⁷ Bal'mont was seen as one of the most musical of the Symbolists. He was ground-breaking in his use of 'highly refined (or even overly refined) style that can overshadow [...] content',⁷⁸ and the 'hypnotic onomatopoeia' of his poetry captivated his readers.⁷⁹ His 1915 essay *Поэзия как волшебство*, in which he declares that 'поэзия есть внутренняя Музыка, внешне выраженная размерною речью', is a particularly in-depth treatise on the use of musical sound in poetry.⁸⁰ Moreover, it was Bal'mont's poetry that prompted the Symbolist trend of linking the structure of poetry to musical compositions, with 'collections of verse [...] considered as an organic whole, lyric poems [...] more often presented in cycles, and the *poema* [...] seen as an architectural or symphonic construct.'⁸¹

⁷⁵ See B. J. Baer and N. Olshanskaya (eds.), *Russian writers on translation: An anthology*. (Routledge, London and New York: 2013)

⁷⁶ Pyman, 1994: 62

⁷⁷ Sundaram, 2011: 98

⁷⁸ See R. Peterson, *History of Russian Symbolism* (Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1993), p. 33

⁷⁹ Pyman, 1994: 60

⁸⁰ See K. Bal'mont, *Poeziya kak volshebstvo* (Moscow: Skorpion, 1915)

⁸¹ Pyman, 1994: 62

Bal'mont was conscious of his own musicality, saying of himself, 'мне сладко петь, как сладко петь весенней птице'.⁸² This is demonstrated in both the style and subject matter of his poetry, for instance in 'Змеиный глаз', the first cycle of his 1903 collection *Будем как солнце. Книга символов*. Almost every one of the cycle's twenty-six parts refers to the poet as singing and to his music as an echo of nature, and among them are poems that explore 'Гармония слов', 'Слова-хамелеоны', 'Мои песнопенья' and 'Аккорды'.⁸³ In the cycle's famous second part, Bal'mont recognises the uniqueness of his musical gift, claiming of himself:

Я - изысканность русской медлительной речи,
 Предо мною другие поэты - предтечи,
 Я впервые открыл в этой речи уклоны,
 Перепевные, гневные, нежные звоны.

Я - внезапный излом,
 Я - играющий гром,
 Я - прозрачный ручей,
 Я - для всех и ничей.

[...]

Вечно юный, как сон,
 Сильный тем, что влюблен
 И в себя и в других,
 Я - изысканный стих.⁸⁴

⁸² See K. Bal'mont, 'Revolutsioner ya ili net?' In *Revolutsioner ya ili net?* (Moscow: Verf', 1918)

⁸³ Bal'mont, 2010: 356-370

⁸⁴ See K. Bal'mont, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomach* (vol.1) (Moscow: Knigovek, 2010), pp.354-355

The importance of musicality to Bal'mont's translation of dramatic texts manifested itself in the productions on which he collaborated with Tairov. Firstly, in Bal'mont's essay on Kalidasa, he refers to the playwright as a 'dramatic poet' and calls for drama to be an expression of poetry, which Bal'mont clearly associated with music.⁸⁵ Moreover, Bal'mont explicitly claims that music should be used as the basis for drama if theatre is to reach the heights of Kalidasa's play *Sakuntala*: 'основой наших мыслей мы сделаем музыку, благоговение и поющую мечту'.⁸⁶ Interestingly, in discussing the role of the poet in the theatre in general, Tairov makes a similar reference to Bal'mont's beloved ancient Indian theatre tradition, explaining how, in the work of the actors, 'им помогал [...] поэт, облакавший в стихотворные стансы их речь тогда, когда этого требовал нараставший пафос их эмоции'.⁸⁷ Music was also central to the Kamerny Theatre production of *Salome*, as explained by Tairov in his essay 'Музыка в театре,' which focuses not on the use of music as such, but on the musical use of the text in his productions, 'который я условно называю оркестровкой пьесы и ритмическим разрешением ее'.⁸⁸ Tairov draws particular attention to the musicality of Bal'mont's translation of *Salome*, saying that 'ритмический и контрапунктический рисунок так четко бьется в ее словесном материале и так неудержимо вызывает к

⁸⁵ Bal'mont, 1990

⁸⁶ Bal'mont, 1990

⁸⁷ Tairov, 1970a: 151

⁸⁸ See A. Tairov, Tairov, A., 'Музыка в театре' in *O teatre (Zapiski rezhisyera)* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshchestvo, 1970b), pp.153-155 (p.153)

воплощению, что пройти мимо него, по-моему, абсолютно невозможно.⁸⁹

The clearly documented overlap of Tairov's and Bal'mont's views on musicality and the role of the poet is especially helpful in the current research. Indeed, of all the similarities between Tairov's and Bal'mont's theoretical views of theatre, this affinity has the greatest practical implications, since Bal'mont was three times entrusted with the phonetic manifestation of his and Tairov's theatrical vision. Bal'mont's incorporation of musicality into his translation choices will be demonstrated in the case study of his version of *Romeo and Juliet*.

Tairov's 'Revolutionary' theatre

Following the Revolution, theatres remained a popular source of entertainment despite the difficult material circumstances,⁹⁰ and the period of War Communism saw a burst of theatre experimentation. In the 'left-wing' group of theatres were Proletkul't, Meyerhold's Studio, workers' theatres and street troupes, while the most prominent representative of the 'right' was Stanislavsky's Moscow Art Theatre. Tairov's theatre was described in 1924 as one of the remaining members of the post-Revolutionary 'centre' group of theatres, many of which were run by the

⁸⁹ Tairov, 1970b: 153

⁹⁰ See R. Leach, 'Futurism and Revolution' in *Russian Futurist Theatre: Theory and Practice* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2018), pp.47-76 (p.49)

State and controlled by Lunacharsky.⁹¹ The Kamerny Theatre was among several theatres characterised as bringing together aspects of both left-wing 'communist' theatre and the individualistic theatre of the right: 'Like the State theatre directly under Lunacharsky, they cling to the traditional in matter. In manner they partly continue the Right Group traditions, and partly apply the Left Group principles in seeking to develop a curious blend of symbolic and revolutionary method.'⁹² The changing socio-political context had led to a distinct shift in Tairov's view of his productions, as the director himself noted:

В революцию наш театр вошел без связи с классом, эту революцию произведшим. Отсюда наше субъективное восприятие революционной действительности было восприятием не с точки зрения классовой борьбы, а с точки зрения революционного пафоса, революционных потенций, революционной патетики, революционной силы этого периода.⁹³

Tairov's new perception of theatre's role is demonstrated by the types of play that he staged immediately after the Revolution. Particularly noteworthy is the increase in harlequinades: Lothar's 'King Harlequin' in November 1917, Debussy's pantomime 'The Toy Box' in December 1917 and Hoffman's Princess Brambilla in May 1920.⁹⁴ Tairov himself described how pertinent the form of the harlequinade was to the atmosphere of the

⁹¹ See H. Carter, *The New Theatre and Cinema of Soviet Russia* (London: Chapman and Dodd, 1924), pp.128-129

⁹² Carter, 1924: 148

⁹³ Tairov, 1970e: 202-203

⁹⁴ Golovashenko, 1970a: 511-512

revolution, where masks were torn off and reality was exposed.⁹⁵ Even those productions of the period which were not explicitly harlequinades exhibited a similar theme. For instance, Tairov saw Oscar Wilde's tragedy *Salome*, staged in October 1917, as part of his change of direction. Just as *King Harlequin* saw the ripping off of the royal mask, *Salome* showed how the 'маскировка библией, маскировка целым рядом религиозных обрядов, предрассудков, традиций' could be removed, and provided an example of the 'революционного ниспровержения божества, во имя жизни, во имя плоти, во имя плодоносности жизни'.⁹⁶

Tairov clearly saw *Romeo and Juliet* as suitable for this new phase of his theatre practice. In describing 'How I Work on the Classics', he claimed that classic works must be presented in such a way that they remain relevant to the contemporary audience. This could be ensured by pruning those parts of classic plays which had lost their effect, like a 'садовник отсекает омертвевшие ветки дерева, не только не раня этим дерева, но, наоборот, сообщая ему новую жизнеспособность и жизнеустойчивость'.⁹⁷ Referring to *Romeo and Juliet* specifically, Tairov explains that he attempted to rid the play of its Romantic associations, propagated by figures like Belinsky.⁹⁸ The play is 'не сладкая «песнь песней любви», а симфония дерзновенной и страстной, могучей и

⁹⁵ Tairov, 1970e: 203

⁹⁶ Tairov, 1970e: 203

⁹⁷ See A. Tairov, 'Как я работayu nad klassikami' in *O teatre (Ob iskusstve teatra)* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshchestvo, 1970f), pp.240-242 (pp.241-242)

⁹⁸ See S. Nel's, 'Romeo i Dzhul'etta: Optimisticheskaya tragediya' in *Shakespeare na sovetskoy stsene* (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1960), pp.93-104

всепоглощающей, прекрасной и жестокой любовной стихии'.⁹⁹ It is a 'трагический скетч'¹⁰⁰ and, in places, a harlequinade.¹⁰¹ Tairov's wife, Alisa Koonen, who played Juliet in the production, reiterates Tairov's view of the play in her memoir, explaining how, for Tairov, the theme of the play was the 'горячая и сильная любовь двух молодых людей, на пути которых стоят препятствия, которые нужно преодолеть'.¹⁰²

Similar interpretations of the play would go on to appear elsewhere in Europe in the following years. For instance, in Paris in 1925, Cocteau also staged a harlequinade version of *Romeo and Juliet*, which Joseph Warren Beach claimed to be the most 'living' Shakespeare he had seen onstage. In his review he repeats Tairov's words almost exactly, saying that 'to resuscitate a classic it is necessary to translate him into the imaginative terms of our own time'.¹⁰³ For Beach, 'in our mechanical age, it was most natural to represent human beings in pantomime, abstracting from all that makes them individuals'.¹⁰⁴

For Tairov to produce a truly Neo-Realist production, this new interpretation of the play would need to be reflected in the 'rhythm' of every aspect of the production, just as it had been in his previous productions. For instance, in his staging choices, Tairov set out the action of the play across seven platforms of different heights, 'на которых могло

⁹⁹ Tairov, 1921: 290

¹⁰⁰ Tairov, 1970f: 242

¹⁰¹ Tairov, 1970f

¹⁰² See A. Koonen, 'Moi shekspirovskiye roli' in *Shekspirovskiy sbornik* (1958)

¹⁰³ See J. W. Beach, Shakespeare and Harlequin. *The Virginia Quarterly Review*, 1(2) (1935), pp.247-260

¹⁰⁴ Beach, 1935

стремительно развиваться все наполненное бесчисленными препятствиями действие'.¹⁰⁵ Koonen also notes that the roles were to be played simply, since 'простота и сдержанность исполнения могут помочь донести до зрителя глубину и общечеловечность искусства Шекспира'.¹⁰⁶ Although Tairov makes no explicit reference to the text of *Romeo and Juliet*, considering these descriptions of the scenic atmosphere, it might be proposed that the text of the play would be required to reflect the same worldliness and simplicity. This is supported by Alisa Koonen's comments about Tairov's approach to the translation of Racine's *Phèdre*, which premiered nine months after *Romeo and Juliet*. Koonen describes the significant involvement of Tairov in the translation process, noting his advice to Briusov to deviate from the meter of the original, which was seen as inappropriate, as it 'разруша[л] наше представление о трагедии.'¹⁰⁷

While Tairov's method 'aligned with Briusov's own thoughts'¹⁰⁸ at the time, the same cannot be said of Bal'mont. Shershenevich attacked Bal'mont's translation and its failure to fulfil Tairov's expectations, recalling in his memoirs how 'принять этот текст было невозможно. Ставить в старом тексте, все же лучше, чем бальмонтовский, Таиров не хотел. Он заказал мне исправить бальмонтовщину. Я отказался

¹⁰⁵ Tairov, 1921: 291

¹⁰⁶ Koonen: 1958

¹⁰⁷ See A. Koonen, *Stranitsy zhizni* (Iskusstvo: Moscow, 1985), p. 267

¹⁰⁸ Koonen, 1985: 267

наводить лоск на эту парикмахерскую работу. Пришлось делать новый перевод'.¹⁰⁹

Bal'mont's opposition to modernising and simplifying the classics for a post-Revolutionary audience is undoubtedly linked to his broader disillusionment with the October Revolution and his wish to separate the spheres of art and politics. In 1918, Bal'mont published a collection of works entitled *Революционер я или нет?*¹¹⁰ and argues in the title essay that 'поэт выше всяких партий. Выше или ниже, это там всячески бывает, но, во всяком случае, – вне.'¹¹¹ He rejects the narrow definition of 'revolutionary art', claiming that:

нет, в сущности, ни одного гения, ни одного крупного таланта, который по природе своей не был бы революционным. Гений и крупный талант почти всегда ломает старое и создает новое. Если же в силу каких-либо частичных условий личности или исторических обстоятельств гений выступает защитником старого, самая выразительность всех его движений и проявлений возбуждает вокруг него такую бурю, что он обостряет и усиливает возникшую борьбу за новое, и в этом случае не прямо, но косвенно все равно является революционной силой.¹¹²

Bal'mont's refusal to 'revolutionise' his work in the manner of Tairov will be further explored in the following section, in a close reading of his translation of *Romeo and Juliet*. In many ways, Bal'mont's abstention

¹⁰⁹ Shershenevich in Lutsenko, 2019: 89

¹¹⁰ Bal'mont, 1918

¹¹¹ Bal'mont, 1918

¹¹² Bal'mont, 1918

from Tairov's newly evolving theatre norms can be seen as part of his retention of Symbolist norms.

Bal'mont's *Romeo and Juliet*: a case study

The translation that Tairov ultimately used for his 1921 production of *Romeo and Juliet*, by Shershenevich, does not survive, removing the possibility of comparing Bal'mont's version with a version approved by Tairov. However, Bal'mont's translation itself provides evidence of the influence of the norms discussed above. In addition, comparisons of Bal'mont's translation with two older translations – which Shershenevich suggested as more appropriate for Tairov's production than Bal'mont's¹¹³ – serve to highlight Bal'mont's translation choices. These are Mikhailovsky's 1899 version of the play, and Grigoriev's 1860 version.

First, and most striking, is Bal'mont's prioritisation of Shakespeare's poetic form and musicality, sometimes resulting in the modification of Shakespeare's wording. As part of achieving this, Bal'mont often uses the high-flown language and constructions that he admired in the Romantics and which had become so characteristic of his own poetry.

An example of this can be found in Act 2, when Juliet calls Romeo back to her and Romeo responds with the following lines:

It is my soul that calls upon my name.
How silver-sweet sound lovers' tongues by night,
Like softest music to attending ears¹¹⁴

¹¹³ Shershenevich in Lutsenko, 2019: 89

¹¹⁴ See W. Shakespeare (ed. René Weis), *Romeo and Juliet* (Arden Shakespeare Third Series) (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2012), II.ii.164-6

Bal'mont's version reads:

Душа моя моё здесь кличет имя!
 Как серебристо-нежен звук любовный
 В ночной тиши – в нём музыка для слуха¹¹⁵

Mikhailovsky's version reads:

То милая моя зовёт меня
 Как сладостно звучат слова влюбленных
 В ночной тиши, лелея нежно слух,
 Как музыка!¹¹⁶

Grigoriev's version reads:

Душа моя меня, я слышу, кличеть
 По имени! Рчь милой въ тишинь ночной —
 Что музыки серебряные звуки!¹¹⁷

From a formal perspective, some of the most important features of the original lines are arguably: their meter; their auditory effects; and the way in which the content is organised across the lines. Firstly, in Shakespeare, the meter is unrhymed iambic pentameter with masculine endings. Bal'mont adheres most closely to this uniformity, retaining

¹¹⁵ See K. Bal'mont, 'Uilyam Shekspir. Tragediya "Romeo i Dzul'etta". Perevod s angliskovo K. D. Bal'monta. Publikatsiya T. V. Petrovoi. *Solnechnaya Pryazha*, 5 (2011), pp.132-186 (p.149)

¹¹⁶ See D. Mikhailovsky, *Vil'jam Shekspir. Romeo i Dzhul'etta (perevod D. L. Mikhailovskovo)* (St Petersburg: Kristall, 2001)

¹¹⁷ See A. Grigoriev, 'Naiprevoshodneishaya i prezhalostnaya tragediya Romeo i Dzhul'etta. V piati deistviakh' in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii Shekspira (vol.1)* (ed. S. Vengerov) (St Petersburg: Brokhaus-Efron, 1902)

iambic pentameter throughout and adding a feminine ending to each line. Mikhailovsky, while keeping iambic pentameter, alternates between masculine and feminine endings, while Grigoriev deviates further still from the meter, alternating between iambic pentameter and iambic hexameter.

Secondly, the most striking image of the lines is perhaps the 'silver-sweet sound', due to its sibilance. Bal'mont tries to maintain the compound adjective, with 'серебристо-нежен звук', while Mikhailovsky seems to prioritise content over the form with the single word 'сладостно', while still retaining the synesthetic effect of using the word 'sweet' to describe a sound. Grigoriev, meanwhile changes both the form and the content, transferring the 'silver-sounding' to music from 'tongues' and removing the quality of 'sweetness' from the description of the sound.

Finally, these three lines demonstrate a neat containment of ideas, with one thought confined to each line. In the first, the focus is the person calling Romeo's name; in the second, the sound of lovers talking is described; and in the third, the sound is compared to music. Again, Bal'mont follows this more strictly than both Mikhailovsky and Grigoriev, keeping the same content in each line apart from the transferal of 'by night' to the third line. Mikhailovsky and Grigoriev stick more closely to Shakespeare's exact words but sacrifice some of the structural integrity. In Mikhailovsky's version, the smoothness of the lines is lost slightly due to the enjambment brought about by the addition of a fourth line, while Grigoriev distributes Romeo's thoughts across the lines very differently,

with Romeo's 'name' being transferred to the second line and the 'silver-sweet' being pushed into the final line.

Another formally interesting excerpt from this scene is the parting of Romeo and Juliet. In the original, a couplet spoken by Juliet is followed by a couplet spoken by Romeo:

Juliet: Good night, good night. Parting is such sweet sorrow
That I shall say good night till it be morrow.
Romeo: Sleep dwell upon thine eyes, peace in thy breast;
Would I were sleep and peace, so sweet to rest.¹¹⁸

Bal'mont's version reads:

Juliet: Прощай, прощай, как нежно расставание,
Я до утра продлила бы прощанье
Romeo: Сон ласковым очам, - покой мечтам,
О будь я сном, как сладко было б нам!¹¹⁹

Mikhailovsky's version reads:

Juliet: Прощай, прощай; минуты расставанья
Исполнены столь сладкого страданья,
Что я тебе до самого утра
Готова бы желать спокойной ночи.
Romeo: Пусть крепкий сон глаза твои закроет,
В твоей груди пусть водворится мир.
О если б я был этим сном и миром!¹²⁰

¹¹⁸ *Romeo and Juliet*, II.ii.184-187

¹¹⁹ Bal'mont, 2011: 150

¹²⁰ Mikhailovsky, 2001

Another example of Bal'mont's focus on musicality, in particular, can be found in his translation of the Prologue preceding Act II. In the original, the final two lines of the chorus are:

But passion lends them power, time means, to meet,
Tempering extremities with extreme sweet.¹²²

Bal'mont's version of these lines is:

Но страсть – даст власть, им путь даст – время в беге,
В той крайности изведать крайность неги.¹²³

Mikhailovsky's translation is:

Но случаи им время посылает,
И пыл любви им мужество дает
Для встреч, - и миг блаженства утешает
И сладкую отраду в сердце льет.¹²⁴

Grigoriev's version is:

Но бдить любви надъ ними вѣчный геній:
Укажетъ случай онъ и дастъ возможность имъ
Упитъся въ трепеть блаженствомъ неземнымъ.¹²⁵

¹²² *Romeo and Juliet*, II.0.187-188

¹²³ Bal'mont, 2011: 145

¹²⁴ Mikhailovsky, 2001

¹²⁵ Grigoriev, 1902

Shakespeare's final two lines here are extremely musical, creating a lilting effect and echoing the closeness between Romeo and Juliet by means of several formal methods. For example, in the first line, 'passion' and 'power' are made alliterative, followed by the alliterative and sibilant 'means' and 'meet'. Bal'mont recreates this effect, and arguably heightens it, in his rendering of the lines. First, in place of the alliterative 'p's, Bal'mont uses a triple internal rhyme – 'страсть – даст власть', replicating the strength of the lovers that is embodied in Shakespeare's word choice. This half of the line is then further connected to the second half with another 'даст' in place of the omitted repetition of 'lend' in the original. Furthermore, at the end of the line, where Shakespeare uses sibilance and alliteration in 'time means, to meet', Bal'mont again follows the pattern, with 'время' and 'в бере' acting as two alliterative words with the same use of a lengthened vowel in the dominant first syllable of each word. Finally, the symmetry of Shakespeare's second line is retained by Bal'mont. Like Shakespeare, who splits 'extremities' and 'extreme' with a single word in the middle of the line, Bal'mont separates 'крайности' and 'крайность' with 'изведать', highlighting the two 'extremes' that cancel each other out when Romeo and Juliet are together.

Comparing Bal'mont's version of these lines with those of Mikhailovsky and Grigoriev highlights Bal'mont's comparative prioritisation of Shakespeare's musical effect. In Mikhailovsky's translation, Shakespeare's first line is spread over two and half lines in Russian and prioritises content over musicality. Shakespeare's order of ideas and grammatical

structure are modified, with object followed by subject ('случаи им время посылает') and then subject followed by object ('пыл любви им мужество дает'), and the final 'to meet' being moved to a third line. Shakespeare's final line is reduced to its positive half, as Mikhailovsky describes the lovers' 'миг блаженства' and 'сладкую отраду' without references to the extreme danger of their situation that their bliss will counter. This reduction is also found in Grigoriev's version, in which he has the lovers able to 'Упитаться въ трепеть блаженствомъ неземнымъ' without Shakespeare's wordplay around the collision of 'extremities' and 'extreme'. In Grigoriev's first lines, the structure and musicality is removed along with Shakespeare's imagery as in his version it is the 'любви [...] вѣчный геній who 'Укажетъ случай онъ и дастъ возможность имъ / Упитаться'.

Bal'mont's preoccupation with form and musicality, as well as his individualistic self-expression, unsurprisingly result in an abstention from simplification in his translation. This is arguably the most meaningful way in which Bal'mont fell short of Tairov's expectations for his 1921 production, in which he aimed to repurpose the classic play for a working-class audience through simplification and exaggeration. Indeed, while undoubtedly musical, some of Bal'mont's constructions remain complex, perhaps impeding immediate understanding on the part of the audience. The extracts above serve as instances of this complexity, and other examples can be found throughout Bal'mont's translation. For instance, at

the end of Act 3, when Romeo and Juliet are spending their final morning together, Juliet tells Romeo he must leave:

It is, it is! Hie hence, be gone, away!
 It is the lark that sings so out of tune,
 Straining harsh discords and unpleasing sharps.
 Some say the lark makes sweet division;
 This doth not so, for she divideth us.
 Some say the lark and loathed toad change eyes.
 O, now I would they had changed voices too,
 Since arm from arm that voice doth us affray,
 Hunting thee hence with hunt's-up to the day.
 O, now be gone! More light and light it grows.¹²⁶

Bal'mont's version is formally inventive and complex:

Иди. Спешу. Тот свет есть свет зари.
 То жаворонок так поёт нестройно, -
 Разрывчатый и неприятный звук.
 Кто выдумал, что жаворонок будто
 Поёт раздельно-нежно? О, неправда!
 Он разделяет резкой песней нас.
 Поверьеи есть такое, я слыхала,
 Что жаворонок с ненавистной жабой
 Глазами обменялся. Я б хотела,
 Чтоб обменялся голосом ор с ней.
 Рука с рукой, ты был со мной, и руки
 Он вдруг разъял, поёт нам о разлуке.
 Иди. Уж свет идёт, и свет растёт.¹²⁷

¹²⁶ *Romeo and Juliet*, III.v.26-35

¹²⁷ Bal'mont, 2011: 167

As has been typical of Bal'mont's translation, he often makes attempts to follow Shakespeare's form and musicality. For example, he renders 'harsh discords' with the onomatopoeic 'разрывчатый'. He also echoes Shakespeare's repetitions and word play, recreating 'sweet division' and 'divideth us' with 'раздельно-нежно' and 'разделяет резкой'; 'More light and light it grows' with 'свет идёт, и свет растёт'; and 'hunting' and 'hunt's-up' with the alliterative 'разъял' and 'разлуке'. Moreover, he intensifies the idea of separating 'arm from arm' with 'Рука с рукой, ты был со мной, и руки / Он вдруг разъял' by having the two 'руки' together at the start of the line, as in the original, and then enacting the separation of the hands by ending the line with 'руки' and using enjambment to complete the clause with 'Он вдруг разъял' on the following line. It could be argued that, onstage, and for an uneducated audience, this complexity may have created confusion, despite the appropriateness of its acoustic effect.

Here, it is perhaps most useful to compare Bal'mont's version with that of Radlova, which was also written after the Revolution and for a working-class audience:

Нет, нет, настало! Уходи скорей!
 То жаворонок так не в лад поет,
 Вытягивая жесткий, острый звук.
 Я слышала, что трель его нежна, -
 Неправда: ведь она нас разлучает...
 Что с жабой поменялся он глазами, -
 И голосом пускай бы поменялся:
 Ведь он объятя наши разомкнул;
 Он вместе с ночью и тебя спугнул.
 О, уходи! Светлеет ясный день.¹²⁸

This translation is manifestly more concerned with the comprehension of Shakespeare's content by the audience. The simpler 'жесткий, острый' are used instead of 'Разрывчатый'. Rather than the complex rhetorical question 'Кто выдумал, что жаворонок будто / Поёт раздельно-нежно?', Radlova simply has her heroine say in ordinary speech that 'Я слышала, что трель его нежна', removing Shakespeare's complex play on 'division'/'divideth'. Similarly, there is no reference to arms being pulled away from each other in Radlova's easily comprehensible line 'Ведь он объятя наши разомкнул'. Radlova's active simplification of Shakespeare's text, which contrasts with Bal'mont's incidental complexity in its intentionality, will be considered in more detail in the second half of this thesis, which is dedicated to her translation.

¹²⁸ See A. Radlova, 'Vil'yam Shekspir. Romeo i Dzhul'etta (per. A. Radlovoi)' in *Vil'yam Shekspir. Izbrannye proizvedeniya* (Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaya literature, 1939)

Bal'mont's *Romeo and Juliet* as a landmark translation

From the analysis of Bal'mont's translation choices it becomes clear that, in his version of *Romeo and Juliet*, the translator brought together his Symbolist priorities of individualism and poetic form with the musicality that was central to his and Tairov's vision for theatre, and to Bal'mont's approach to art as a whole. These features dominate his translation, occasionally resulting in the slight modification of Shakespeare's wording. In addition, and arguably as a consequence of adhering to these principles, Bal'mont's translation did not fulfil Tairov's changing needs in 1919. Bal'mont remained the form-oriented Symbolist translator that he had been in the early 1910s, rather than adjusting his translation practice for a post-Revolutionary audience. Tairov, by this point, seemingly needed a Revolutionary poet-translator, who could meet the needs of the new audience and whose rhythm corresponded to the Revolutionary pathos of the time.

It should be remembered, however, that Bal'mont was not simply 'out of touch' with contemporary reality but, as has been noted, his adherence to Symbolist norms was part of an active disagreement with the idea of 'revolutionary' art and with the October Revolution more broadly. Indeed, in the years leading up to his emigration, he refused to sell his works to Proletkul't, reportedly stating 'не могу печатать у тех, у кого руки в

крови,¹²⁹ and complained of the Bolsheviks' 'кровавых руках, держащих Россию за горло'.¹³⁰ He had been planning to leave the country since the autumn of 1919.¹³¹ Interestingly, Bal'mont's emigration was perhaps an additional reason for the rejection of his work by Tairov. After narrowly escaping execution,¹³² Bal'mont was among the many writers who applied for permission to leave the country in 1920, and he was first to be granted this permission with the support of Lunacharsky, on the condition that he 'не будет вредить за границей [sic] интересам Советской Республики'.¹³³ By 1921, he had become a deeply controversial figure due to a false rumour that he had broken this oath of loyalty by making statements against the Soviet Union and, in doing so, had led to other writers being prevented from leaving the country.¹³⁴ Despite these rumours being refuted by Bal'mont and Lunacharsky, as well as by their supposed source, Isidore Gukovsky, Bal'mont was at this time viewed with suspicion by the Soviet authorities, and was perhaps treated with caution by fellow artists.¹³⁵

Despite the fact that Tairov chose to reject Bal'mont's translation, his 1921 production of *Romeo and Juliet* was not a critical success. Several reviewers resented what they saw as the production's dullness and failure

¹²⁹ See S. Polyakov (Litovtsev), O poete Bal'monte. *Posledniye novosti*, 169 (10th November 1920), p.3 in Bird and Ivanova, 2004: 81-82

¹³⁰ See K. Bal'mont. Krovavyye Iguny. *Volya Rossii*, 209 (22nd May 1921), p.4-5 in Bird and Ivanova, 2004: 79

¹³¹ Bal'mont, 1921, p.79

¹³² Polyakov, 1920; Bal'mont, 1921

¹³³ See R. Bird and E. Ivanova, Byl li vinoven Bal'mont? *Russkaya literatura*, 3 (2004), pp.55-85 (p.56)

¹³⁴ Bird and Ivanova, 2004

¹³⁵ Bird and Ivanova, 2004

to capture the spirit of Shakespeare. One highlighted the dissonance between 'полнокровная трагедия Шекспира и дрябло-тряпичные сооружения Экстер' (the designer).¹³⁶ Another lamented the 'Сухость вместо темперамента, черствость вместо огненных чувств, бухгалтерия сердец вместо чудесного раскрытия'.¹³⁷ Morozov, writing in 1947, recalled feeling that in Tairov's production *Romeo and Juliet* 'гибли не от столкновения с окружающим миром, но от слепой случайности'.¹³⁸

However, it could be argued that the production, and the kind of translation that Tairov demanded for it, paved the way for the Socialist Realism that began to develop at the turn of the 1930s. Writing in 1946, Tairov himself claimed that every era has its own form of Realism, including Socialist Realism and that, with each new iteration, the form and style 'видоизменяются в зависимости от идеи, выражающей ту или иную эпоху'.¹³⁹ Clearly the ideas and atmosphere of post-Revolutionary Russia prompted Tairov's gradual move from Neo-Realism in the 1910s to what he refers to as 'Concrete realism' in the mid- and late-1920s, and the start of this shift is already evident in his *Romeo and Juliet*.¹⁴⁰

Charting Tairov's development therefore acts as a bridge between this research into Bal'mont's translation and an exploration of Radlova's 1934

¹³⁶ Treplev in Lutsenko, 2019: 90

¹³⁷ Margolin in Lutsenko, 2019: 90

¹³⁸ Morozov in Lutsenko, 2019: 91

¹³⁹ See A. Tairov, 'Teatr i dramaturg' in *O teatre (Ob iskusstve teatra)* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshchestvo, 1970g), pp.255-264 (p.256)

¹⁴⁰ Golovashenko, 1970: 52

translation of *Romeo and Juliet*. While Tairov's approach to Shakespeare in 1921 was largely unappreciated, by the time Radlova was translating the play for Sergei Radlov in 1934, it seemed appropriate, and was accepted as part of the discussion around how to stage Shakespeare in the emerging culture of Socialist Realism.¹⁴¹ Written at the start of the Socialist Realist period, Radlova's translation appears to share Tairov's focus on worldliness, ease of understanding, and action. She expresses many of the same thoughts as Tairov when discussing her approach to translating Shakespeare, for instance claiming that the first priority when translating Shakespeare is 'точность, близость к подлиннику, но близость не формальная, а живая.'¹⁴² She also notes that, 'считая эквиритмию или эквилинеарность, как ее называют некоторые критики [...], в принципе правильной, я не делаю из нее для себя фетиш'.¹⁴³ Similarly, many of Radlov's intentions, both in the 1920s and as the director of *Romeo and Juliet* in 1934, align closely with Tairov's. The similarities between Tairov, Radlov and Radlova mean that these two translations of *Romeo and Juliet* are not only of interest in isolation, or in relation to their individual contexts. They can also be used to chart the development of Russian theatre in the first half of the twentieth century, and to show a tangible progression from Realism to Symbolism, to Neo-Realism, to 'Concrete Realism', to Socialist Realism.

¹⁴¹ See Tverskoy in D. Zolotnitsky, (ed.), *V sporakh o teatre: sbornik nauchnykh trudov* (St Petersburg, 1992), p.59

¹⁴² See A. Radlova, 'O perevode' in *Gamlet* (Leningrad, 1938)

¹⁴³ Radlova, 1938

Anna Radlova's 1934 version of *Romeo and Juliet*

As in the preceding section focusing on Bal'mont, the following exploration of Radlova's translation will apply a Descriptive Translation Studies approach, taking into account both the type of text under consideration and the specific conditions in which it was created.

Firstly, as with Bal'mont's translation, this section will consider Radlova's translation in its theatrical context. It is important to note that, unlike Bal'mont's translation, Radlova's translation was also published in text form, and was included in Academia's landmark *Vil'yam Shekspir: Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, published between 1936 and 1949.¹⁴⁴ Although the reception of this published version Radlova's translation would undoubtedly be of interest in further studies of Shakespeare translations in the Soviet period, it will not be considered here. In this study, Radlova's translation will be analysed solely from the perspective of its position within a dynamic, live performance, namely Radlov's 1934 production of *Romeo and Juliet*, in which Radlova was – and saw herself as – an active collaborator. In such a situation, 'performability, as the quality that ensures the play's success in stimulating and sustaining the authorized game of make-believe that is the theatre[,] is as much a default concern of stage translation as expressive writing is of the

¹⁴⁴ Tihanov, 2009: 71

novelist.¹⁴⁵ Radlova's translation choices were clearly made with theatregoers and theatre performers in mind, and it was her 'shifting gaze'¹⁴⁶ that completed the hybrid version of Shakespeare – shaped by her personal relation to the text, to theatre practice and to the spectator – that was brought to the Soviet public.

Secondly, the specific circumstances of Radlova's translation career necessitate the exploration of particular areas of influence. Radlova's relationship with translation, and specifically translation for the stage, differs markedly from Bal'mont's. Firstly, while for Bal'mont translation was an integral part of his creative oeuvre, standing equal with his original poetry from the start of his career, for Radlova, translation came as a distinct second phase in her career. Radlova began her creative life as a poet, before transitioning into translation for the stage in the 1920s, perhaps due to her lack of success as a poet. Radlova was therefore a less experienced translator than Bal'mont at the time when she translated *Romeo and Juliet*, and this may be one of the reasons for the lack of commentary on her translation.

However, despite this divergence in overall translation experience, Radlova was arguably at an advantage when translating specifically for the theatre. Unlike Bal'mont, by the time Radlova had begun working as a translator, her entire creative career had been accompanied by a deep

¹⁴⁵ See D. Johnston, 'Metaphor and Metonymy: the Translator-Practitioner's Visibility' in *Staging And Performing Translation* (eds. R. Baines, C. Marinetti, M. Perteghella) (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp.11-30 (p.18)

¹⁴⁶ Johnston, 2011: 19

connection to the theatre world, which was facilitated by her marriage in 1914 to the emerging theatre director Sergei Radlov. This relationship gave her unique access to the developments taking place in Petrograd/Leningrad theatres from the late 1910s until the early 1930s, many of which were driven by Radlov himself. Thus, in the early 1930s, when Radlova started work on *Romeo and Juliet* for Radlov's Studio Theatre, she was already operating within the context of Radlov's norms as a theatre director and avant-garde theatre experimentation more broadly.

These two major aspects of Radlova's translation career – the lack of scholarly commentary on her work and her continuous collaboration with Sergei Radlov – will inform the materials used in this study. Primary materials by Radlova are clearly important although scarce, limited to her translation of *Romeo and Juliet* and her article 'О переводе,' which appeared in the programme for Radlov's 1938 production of *Hamlet*. In addition, Sergei Radlov's writings, and scholarship on his work as a theatre director, will feature heavily in the analysis of Radlova's translation. These will not displace the section's concentration on Radlova herself, but are necessary due to the paucity of materials about Radlova; the fact that Radlova's translations for the stage were commissioned by Radlov for his productions; and the fact that Radlov can be seen a representative and leader of larger trends in post-Revolutionary theatre.

Radlova's 1934 translation of *Romeo and Juliet* occurred at a significant moment, following a decade of theatrical experimentation in Petrograd/Leningrad while also appearing at a pivotal time in the development of Socialist Realism. In order to reflect this, the following study will follow a dual methodological approach, whereby the translation will be analysed in both its synchronic and diachronic contexts. The diachronic approach will consider the experimental atmosphere of Petrograd/Leningrad theatre following the Revolution, as well as Radlov's development over the course of this period. The synchronic approach, on the other hand, will look at Radlova's translation as a specific product of 1934, locating Radlova's work at the intersection between the preceding decade of theatre experiments and the emerging discussions of Socialist Realism and of staging Shakespeare within the Socialist Realist tradition.

Examining the environment in which Radlova developed as a poet and as a translator, particularly her involvement with the work of Radlov, points to three overarching trends by which Radlova's translation was arguably influenced. Firstly, Radlov was part of a theatre tradition which looked back to various forms of popular theatre. This influence can be found not only in Radlov's staging of *Romeo and Juliet*, but also in Radlova's translation for the production, particularly the translation's move away from Romanticism and its juxtaposition of comedy and tragedy. Secondly, the post-Revolutionary period saw an enthusiasm for mass spectacles. Again, Radlov was highly involved in several mass dramatic productions and pageants, as well as in circus performances. The principles of these

forms of entertainment and artistry are reflected in the way Radlova's translation presents the play as a form of entertainment. Finally, the influence of Expressionism and Emotionalism can be felt in the style of Radlova's translation. During the 1920s, in the period leading up to the production of *Romeo and Juliet*, both Radlova and Radlov were leading members of the Emotionalist movement. Radlova produced several collections of Emotionalist poetry and Radlov incorporated Emotionalist and Expressionist tendencies in his approach to drama, such as achieving a harmony between the speech and movement of his actors, as will be discussed further.

In addition to the influence of avant-garde theatre experimentation, Radlova was arguably influenced by the appearance of Socialist Realism in the arts. While Socialist Realism first established itself in literature,¹⁴⁷ it was also beginning to infiltrate theatre. Radlov's *Romeo and Juliet* is arguably one of the first productions in which its influence can be felt, particularly in Radlova's translation. After demonstrating Radlova's incorporation of 1920s theatre experimentation into her translation, as well as her awareness of discussions around Socialist Realism, it will be argued that this confluence of norms was responsible for the translation's success. In many cases, the norms of 1920s theatre either coincided with, or were repurposed for, Socialist Realist ends.

¹⁴⁷ Dobrenko, 2011

Sergei Radlov and the theatrical experiments of post-Revolutionary Petrograd/Leningrad

Popular theatre

The rediscovery of popular theatre techniques did not begin with the Revolution, when theatre began to open up to more diverse audiences. Its use by the intelligentsia can be traced back to the 'Народный театр' movement of the 1860s, the aim of which 'was to propagate high culture among the masses, not to perpetuate popular culture.'¹⁴⁸ The educational role of mass theatre continued with the pre-Revolutionary left-wing intelligentsia.¹⁴⁹ At the same time, popular theatre was also employed in the dramatic experiments of those with more esoteric aims, as has been seen from the work and theories of Tairov, whose popular theatre techniques were employed as part of a response to the Romanticism and Naturalism of the nineteenth century.¹⁵⁰ In addition, the traditions of pantomime, *commedia dell'arte* and Russian *balagan* were often seen in Symbolist theatre, which was most famously brought to the stage by Meyerhold.¹⁵¹

Meyerhold's theatre studio, which opened in St Petersburg in 1913 and had Sergei Radlov among its first students,¹⁵² brought together the

¹⁴⁸ See C. Kelly, 'Petrushka and the Pioneers: The Russian Carnival Puppet Theatre after the Revolution' in *Discontinuous Discourses in Modern Russian Literature* (eds. C. Kelly, M. Makin, D. Shepherd), (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1989), pp.73-111 (p.76)

¹⁴⁹ Kelly, 1989

¹⁵⁰ Markov, 1970: 18

¹⁵¹ See M. Green, The Russian Symbolist Theater: Some Connections. *Pacific Coast Philology*, 12 (1977), pp.5-14 (p.6)

¹⁵² See D. Zolotnitsky, *Sergei Radlov: The Shakespearian Fate of a Soviet Director* (Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1998), p.4

aesthetic and educational possibilities of popular theatre. Aleksei Gripich, one of his students, recounts Meyerhold's preoccupation with genre:

Мейерхольд решал сценическую задачу всегда в определенном приеме (например, в приеме гротеска, трагического фарса, патетической романтики, урбанизма), подсказывал стилистическую манеру исполнения (например, в манере Калло, в традициях спектаклей XVII и XVIII веков, в стиле русского балагана, французской арлекинады).¹⁵³

Particularly important was an education in popular theatre. The students were given the task of creating pantomimes after learning about the techniques of *commedia dell'arte* with Vladimir Soloviev, who would initiate the students into ways of organising scenic space and structuring mise-en-scenes.¹⁵⁴

The studio's training was part of Meyerhold's broader vision of creating his own 'people's theatre', whose basis he saw in the popular theatre of the past, 'в русском балагане, итальянской Commedia dell'arte, японском театре «Кабуки», в Шекспировском театре, в испанском театре эпохи Возрождения, в русском театре 30-х и 40-х годов XIX века'.¹⁵⁵ Like Tairov in Moscow, Meyerhold was simultaneously engaging with and moving away from the approach of the Symbolists. However, while Tairov developed his esoteric Neo-Realism before moving toward a theatre for the masses, Meyerhold was already predicting a new, popular audience

¹⁵³ See A. Gripich, 'Uchitel' stseny' in *Vstrechi s Meierkhol'dom. Sbornik Vospominanii* (Moscow: Vserossiiskoye Teatralnoye Obshchestvo, 1967), pp.114-145 (p.119)

¹⁵⁴ Gripich, 1967: 122

¹⁵⁵ Gripich, 1967: 128

for his work before the Revolution. Throughout the mid-1910s, he was engaged in polemics with critics and complained that 'буржуазная публика его не понимает, а вот прием выступлений студии в лазаретах показывает, что солдаты (подразумевается народ) понимают его.'¹⁵⁶

Radlov joined Meyerhold's studio in 1913, when it opened, and soon became a star pupil, eventually being invited to teach at the studio in 1917.¹⁵⁷ He clearly shared his teacher's enthusiasm for popular theatre, as demonstrated by the prevalence of four major features of popular theatre in many of Radlov's productions: an underlying sense of optimism; the juxtaposition of comedy and tragedy; the incorporation of 'high' and 'low' content; and a rejection of Romanticism. These appeared across a range of production styles, from Radlov's early work with musical theatre and operetta to his operatic and dramatic productions.¹⁵⁸ Given the fact that Meyerhold and Radlov saw Shakespeare as foundational in the formation of a new popular theatre, it is unsurprising that features of popular theatre were also emphasised in Radlov's Shakespeare productions.

Writing in 1920, Radlov had already begun to express that the 'dramas of Shakespeare, Moliere, Hans Sachs, and Calderon [...] expressed the true popular aspiration of past epochs [...] It was the "deaf and blind"

¹⁵⁶ Gripich, 1967: 129

¹⁵⁷ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 4

¹⁵⁸ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 58-60

nineteenth century, [...] that destroyed the people's theatre, replacing it with Realism, "a barbarous memorial from the barbarous end of the nineteenth century".¹⁵⁹ Once again, it is interesting to note how close Radlov was to Tairov's view, even in his wish to simultaneously see Shakespeare as a 'realist' while rejecting 'Realism' in the sense of the Naturalism of the nineteenth-century stage. However, while Tairov seemingly failed to promote his vision in his 1921 production of *Romeo and Juliet*,¹⁶⁰ Radlov's development of this approach suggests that, by 1934, it was gaining wider acceptance.

Viewing Shakespeare as a popular playwright led to Radlov's shift away from the Romantic reading of *Romeo and Juliet*. During the nineteenth century, this had been the dominant interpretation of the play, inspired by the German Romantics, who saw the lovers' tragic end as a punishment for their sinful passion, and Belinsky, who proposed that Romeo and Juliet's love was too pure to survive on Earth.¹⁶¹ For Radlov, however, as for Tairov, interpreting Shakespeare in a humanistic, realistic way was central to maintaining the playwright's relevance and of bringing it into the present.¹⁶² Thus, just as Tairov had attempted in his 1919 production, Radlov in 1934 aimed to move toward a dynamic and modern presentation of the story which was relatable for the audience.¹⁶³

¹⁵⁹ See M. Gordon, Radlov's Theatre of Popular Comedy. *The Drama Review: TDR*, 19(4) (1975), pp.113-116 (p.115)

¹⁶⁰ Lutsenko, 2019: 90-91

¹⁶¹ Nel's, 1960

¹⁶² Zolotnitsky, 1998: 52

¹⁶³ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 118

An underlying sense of optimism was central to this vision of the play. Radlov believed that *Romeo and Juliet* was 'a play about a struggle for love, for the right to love, of the young, strong and progressive people fighting with feudal traditions [...] This makes the play living, and permeated with a spirit of struggle and passion'.¹⁶⁴ Later that year, the director took this life-affirming approach to a new extreme when working on Prokofiev's ballet version of the play for the Leningrad State Academic Theatre of Opera and Ballet. Working on the four-act libretto with Adrian Piotrovsky, Radlov went as far as to give the story a happy ending.¹⁶⁵ While this major diversion from the original storyline was ultimately rejected, it nonetheless demonstrates the positivity with which Radlov read the story. Indeed, according to Zolotnitsky, 'the director considered that the hero's passions could become tragic only if it was motivated by being essentially positive.'¹⁶⁶

Radlov's anti-Romantic, optimistic reading of the play manifested itself most clearly in his production's juxtaposition of comedy and tragedy. This had been a feature of Radlov's Shakespearean tragedies since his 1927 version of *Othello*, which he described as 'built upon a well-considered and regular alternation of the tragic and the comic.'¹⁶⁷ Seven years later, Konstantin Tverskoy, a director working on *Richard III* at the Bolshoi Drama Theatre, described Radlov's *Romeo and Juliet* in similar terms:

¹⁶⁴ Radlov in Zolotnitsky, 1998: 115

¹⁶⁵ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 113-114

¹⁶⁶ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 132

¹⁶⁷ Radlov in Zolotnitsky, 1998: 51

‘ряд полнокровных, по-шекспировски реалистически трактованных сцен, где высокое и низкое, смешное и трагическое выступают в их взаимопроникновении.’¹⁶⁸ For Tverskoy, the staging was something to be learnt from; as an experiment, it ‘непременно должен быть учтен другими театрами, работающими над классикой, в частности над Шекспиром.’¹⁶⁹ The poet and playwright Nikolai Kostarev also noticed the interplay of the comic and the tragic, drawing attention to the scene in which the lifeless Juliet is discovered by her parents: ‘Наверху лежит мертвая Джульетта. Над ней ломает руки мать. Скорбит отец. Внизу пьяные слуги горланят песни’.¹⁷⁰ Interestingly, Tairov had been similarly attentive to this scene, which he singled out in his article about *Romeo and Juliet*, insisting that the usually-omitted episode with the musicians ought to be retained by theatre directors.¹⁷¹ Again, the approaches of Tairov and Radlov appear to have had much in common. Seemingly, however, it was only in the formative years of Socialist Realism that such experimentation was beginning to be integrated successfully into Soviet theatre.

The traces of popular theatre in Radlov’s production were noted by reviewers and commentators in the 1930s. For some, it was seen as a desecration of the versions of Shakespeare to which they were accustomed. The critic Yuzovsky, for example, (described by one

¹⁶⁸ Tverskoy Zolotnitsky, 1992: 59

¹⁶⁹ Tverskoy in Zolotnitsky, 1992: 59

¹⁷⁰ Kostarev in Zolotnitsky, 1992: 59

¹⁷¹ Tairov, 1921: 289

commentator as 'a defender of the romanticized Shakespeare that had traditionally been played on the Russian stage')¹⁷² saw Radlov's Shakespeare as an extension of the vaudevilles that Radlov was staging at the same time: '*Romeo and Juliet* in Radlov's Theatre [...] is closer to Karatyagin than to Shakespeare both in its performance and in its interpretation [...] we need not mention that Montague, for example, is "toned down" to a common comic personage from Karatyagin's vaudeville.'¹⁷³ In Yuzovsky's castigatory view, 'Radlov was afraid to be romantic.'¹⁷⁴

However, many others, including theatre directors and playwrights, were inspired by Radlov's new interpretation. The theatre director Nikolai Akimov felt that he had been present

при совлечении Шекспира с ложноклассического пьедестала, при устранении в нем декламации, эстетических мизансцен и т. п. Я увидел, что к Шекспиру подходят, как к автору, который может сам за себя постоять, даже если осветить его сильным фонарем или рассматривать его при дневном свете.'¹⁷⁵

Similarly, Kostarev saw the rejection of the Romantic and sentimental as heightening the true tragedy of the play, citing the scene in which Romeo learns of his banishment:

¹⁷² Zolotnitsky, 1998: 120

¹⁷³ Yuzovsky in Zolotnitsky, 1998: 117

¹⁷⁴ Yuzovsky in Zolotnitsky, 1998: 119

¹⁷⁵ Akimov in Zolotnitsky, 1992: 60

Ромео в исступлении катается по полу... Монах корит его и издевается над ним за это малодушие и мальчишество, — и на самом деле это последняя юношеская вспышка у Ромео; внешне она выражается нелепостями: в нем все кипит!.. Но уже поднявшись с пола, Ромео идет до конца драмы прямой и спокойный и до прозрачности ясный, овеянный трагедией надвигающегося события.¹⁷⁶

In this way, it seems that the popular theatre techniques that Radlov had explored since the mid-1910s were becoming accepted and even promoted as important aspects of Shakespearean tragedy.

The analysis of Radlova's translation in the case study to follow, will serve to show how her choices supported the optimism and anti-Romanticism of Radlov's productions. It will also demonstrate how her translation seems to have successfully fulfilled Radlov's attempt to historicise and modernise Shakespeare and, in doing so, also responded to Socialist Realism's emerging interest in humanism and the Renaissance.

Mass theatre

The general post-Revolutionary interest in popular theatre manifested itself more specifically in an enthusiasm for mass spectacles and circus performances, particularly in Petrograd. Mass spectacles were theorised most famously in Platon Kerzhentsev's *Творчество театра*, which called

¹⁷⁶ Kostarev in Zolotnitsky, 1992: 61

for a replacement of professional theatre with popular, amateur theatre.¹⁷⁷ Kerzhentsev was a leading member of Proletkul't whose vision for mass theatre was 'to bring art "to the streets,"'¹⁷⁸ in the form of communal spectacles celebrating the events and atmosphere of the Revolution. Perhaps the most famous example of this was the 1920 mass re-enactment of the storming of the Winter Palace, produced by Nikolai Evreinov and performed by a cast of six thousand performers for an audience of one hundred thousand spectators.¹⁷⁹ The mass spectacle was an attempt to break down barriers between performer and spectator and between social groups, using techniques taken from carnival, *commedia dell'arte* and the circus.¹⁸⁰

These mass spectacles were not only forms of entertainment, but were also used for educational purposes, to help form a 'New Soviet Man'. The idea of a 'superman' emerging from the Revolution had already been put forward by Trotsky in his 1924 *Literature and Revolution*,¹⁸¹ and would continue into the Socialist Realist period. However, it was Bogdanov, a founder of Proletkul't, who proposed that the 'New Soviet Man' could be shaped through mass culture, and he promoted an aesthetic of 'life-building', whereby Socialism would be brought about by means of a collective, proletarian culture.¹⁸² Mass theatre would become part of this,

¹⁷⁷ See F. Deák, Russian Mass Spectacles. *The Drama Review: TDR*, 19(2) (1975), pp.7-22 (p.21)
¹⁷⁸ See K. Clark, *Petersburg, Crucible of Cultural Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995), p.124

¹⁷⁹ Clark, 1995: 122

¹⁸⁰ Clark, 1995: 125

¹⁸¹ See L. Trotsky, (ed. W. Keach), *Literature and Revolution* (Chicago, Illinois: Haymarket Books, 2005), p.207

¹⁸² Dobrenko, 2005: 12-13

simultaneously depicting and helping to achieve the Revolution's transformation of society.¹⁸³ This ambition can be seen in the fact that mass performances often presented storylines symbolising the struggle of the proletariat and the final victory of the exploited over their exploiters.¹⁸⁴ In this way, the spectacles aimed to 'revive the pathos of the revolution,' both celebrating the Revolution itself and attempting to bring its exultant atmosphere into the present and the future.¹⁸⁵ For Piotrovsky, a leading director of such spectacles, the aim was to 'transform' the participants and in doing so to provide a 'window into the future'.¹⁸⁶

Radlov took an active role in mass theatre from its beginnings after the Revolution, both as a teacher and as a practitioner. In 1918, Meyerhold's Studio, where Radlov was teaching, met with the Theatre Department of Narkompros,¹⁸⁷ and both Radlov and Meyerhold joined the department, with Radlov becoming part of the repertoire section.¹⁸⁸ Alongside this, Radlov began teaching on Meyerhold's new 'Курсах мастерства сценических постановок.'¹⁸⁹ He promoted Meyerhold's call 'к разрыву со сценой-коробкой, к устройству представлений на площадях, к театрализации народных празднеств, к украшению улиц', as well as Meyerhold's ideas 'о походном театре, проникающем в самую гущу

¹⁸³ Dobrenko, 2005: 13

¹⁸⁴ Deák, 1975: 7-9

¹⁸⁵ Clark, 1995: 133

¹⁸⁶ Piotrovsky in Clark, 1995: 126

¹⁸⁷ Gripich, 1967: 130

¹⁸⁸ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 5

¹⁸⁹ Gripich, 1967: 137

народных масс.¹⁹⁰ In April 1919, when Meyerhold was forced to leave Leningrad for health reasons, Radlov took over as the leader of the course.¹⁹¹

The same year, Radlov was personally involved in producing mass open-air spectacles and pageants. He organised two productions at the Baltic Navy Theatre, working in the mass cultural organizations of the Petrograd military district and the Baltic navy.¹⁹² 1920 saw his acclaimed production of *The Sword of Peace* to celebrate the second anniversary of Red Army, which involved joint theatrical societies of the Petrograd garrison, as well as the chorus and the band of the military district,¹⁹³ and a May Day production of *The Promethean Fire* for a Red Army audience. Between 1920 and 1922, he was responsible for three further mass outdoor pageants and, despite the fact that the NEP period saw a retreat from the "huge, free squares" into the "boxes" and "kitchens",¹⁹⁴ mass theatre clearly continued to inspire Radlov. In 1927 and 1929, he produced mass performances in Leningrad to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the Revolution and the results of the first year of the first Five Year Plan respectively.¹⁹⁵ Finally, as late as 1932, Radlov directed an open-air production of *Oedipus Rex* (1932), which was seen as unusual for its time and was a great success.¹⁹⁶

¹⁹⁰ Gripich, 1967: 144

¹⁹¹ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 5

¹⁹² Zolotnitsky, 1998: 5

¹⁹³ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 5

¹⁹⁴ Clark, 1995: 146

¹⁹⁵ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 67-68

¹⁹⁶ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 70-71

Mass spectacles went on to influence Radlov's dramatic productions, particularly in their celebration and promotion of a 'New Man'. Already in 1928, the literature and drama critic Mokulsky was drawing attention to the way in which Radlov used actors not just to talk to the audience, but to be exemplary citizens. Part of this was manifested in the prioritization of action over speech. While in the nineteenth century, as well as in the NEP period, the actor had become 'mainly a talker', Radlov reversed this: 'modern man, a man of action, made it the playwright's task to express this ability for action.'¹⁹⁷ Radlov himself expressed this idea in a 1929 article entitled 'Actor Training': 'Our actor will never carry out his function if he proves unable to become a model of a man as he should be [...] Such an actor, whenever he appears on stage, will be the best kind of agitation for a new way of life and a new man [...] What gigantic work must be done in order to learn creating not only good actors but also such 'exemplary people!'¹⁹⁸ Radlov's version of *Romeo and Juliet* continued to promote this idea, as demonstrated by the fact that the production's atmosphere was felt to be almost Komsomol-like. This was first noted by Piotrovsky, who described Smirnov, the in the role of Romeo, as acting 'чуть ли не с налетом некоего условно "комсомольского", как бы "трамбовского" бодрячества.'¹⁹⁹ One year later, at the Theatre of the Revolution, Mikhail Popov staged another version of *Romeo and Juliet* and

¹⁹⁷ Mokulsky in Zolotnitsky, 1998: 95

¹⁹⁸ Radlov in Zolotnitsky, 1998: 40

¹⁹⁹ See A. Piotrovsky, "'Romeo i dzhul'etta" v Teatre-studii p/r S. E. Radlova' (1934) in *Teatr. Kino. Zhizn'*. (Leningrad: Iskusstvo: 1969), pp.117-120 (p.119)

dedicated it to the Komsomol, and later in 1935 Radlov himself claimed that *Romeo and Juliet* was 'maybe, the most 'Komsomol-like' of all Shakespearean plays.'²⁰⁰

In addition, Radlov was particularly inspired by the incorporation of circus techniques into the theatre. The use of circus performers had been used for Revolutionary purposes since the Revolution, for instance during and after the Civil War, when 'travelling troupes of actors' would perform agitprop 'to keep up morale among the soldiery during the war, and after it to propagate literacy and hygiene.'²⁰¹ The most famous of these was the *Sinyaya bluza*, whose 'acts mixed circus acts and acrobatics with literary forms.'²⁰² Circus performers were also included in mass spectacles, for instance in Evreinov's famous 1920 showcase, in which 'the audience was treated to a comic interlude as the circus stars [...] gave free reign to buffoonery and acrobatics.'²⁰³

However, it was Radlov who introduced this kind of entertainment into the theatre in Petrograd, through his Theatre of Popular Comedy, which operated from 1920 to 1922. The theatre aimed to revive the methods of popular theatre in a new, Revolutionary environment²⁰⁴ and engaged 'the services of professional circus entertainers and acrobats rather than that of actors.'²⁰⁵ Radlov also exhibited his understanding of and closeness to

²⁰⁰ Radlov in Zolotnitsky, 1998: 115

²⁰¹ Kelly: 1989, 79

²⁰² Kelly: 1989, 79

²⁰³ Clark, 1995: 123

²⁰⁴ See V. Shklovsky, *Sobranie sochinenii: Tom 1. Revolyutsiya* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2018), p.284

²⁰⁵ Gordon, 1975: 114

circus techniques in the traditional circus setting. For example, his 1927 production *October in the Ring*, a celebration of the tenth anniversary of the Revolution, was staged at the Leningrad State Circus to great acclaim.²⁰⁶ That same year Gvozdev, a leading Leningrad critic, declared Radlov's hybrid style as representative of post-Revolutionary Soviet theatre: 'Так создался новый русский театр революционных лет [...] Крупные режиссерские таланты научили строить большой, разнообразный, увлекательный спектакль, с вовлечением в театральную игру вещей, света, музыки, станков и обновленного физкультурой тела актеров [...] Эта новая динамика театра выросла как подлинное детище бурных лет революции.'²⁰⁷

Many features of Radlov's early 'circusation' of theatre would go on to be found in his dramatic stagings of Shakespeare. For example, while at the Theatre of Popular Comedy, Radlov ensured that 'the expressive capacities of variety and circus arts were immersed, as it were, into the nutrient medium of theatricality prepared with considerations to the well-known script patterns of the Italian commedia dell'arte.'²⁰⁸ Indeed, Annenkov reproved 'similarity of plot' in Radlov's productions: 'a love triangle that ultimately results in the victory of the young over the old.'²⁰⁹ Later, Radlov would similarly promote *Romeo and Juliet* as a tragedy based on youthful protagonists triumphing over stale tradition. In the

²⁰⁶ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 68

²⁰⁷ See A. A. Gvozdev, 'Realizm i dostizheniya revoliutsionnogo teatra' in *Teatral'naya Kritika* (Leningrad: Iskusstvo, 1987), pp.56-60 (p.59)

²⁰⁸ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 10

²⁰⁹ Gordon, 1975: 114-115

same way, regarding the experience of the audience, the Theatre of Popular Comedy employed a simple, flat stage, without depth which was reminiscent of 'Shakespeare's theatre' and felt close to the 'unsophisticated, responsive and grateful' audience.²¹⁰ Later, in Radlov's Shakespeare productions, a comparable set-up was used, and acts were punctuated by unobstructed interactions with the audience, with 'интермедиями на просцениуме, часто пантомимными, часто смешными.'²¹¹

An examination of Radlova's translation choices in *Romeo and Juliet* in the case study below will demonstrate the ways in which she balanced the influence of mass, amateur spectacles and the circus with the emerging demands of Socialist Realism. In particular, her choices show a wish to entertain the audience through a striking and memorable script while controlling any impulses to simply entertain the audience.

Expressionism

A final trend that became prominent in post-Revolutionary Petrograd and was incorporated into Radlov's theatre work was that of Expressionism, which originated in post-WWI Germany and became popular during the Westernism of the Soviet Union's NEP period.²¹² In fact, many of Radlov's

²¹⁰ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 9

²¹¹ Zolotnitsky, 1992: 58

²¹² Clark, 1995: 164

experiments with popular theatre and mass theatre share many features with the eclectic norms of German Expressionist theatre. For example, German Expressionism often looked back to the Renaissance, incorporating grotesque comedy, masks and exaggerated gestures, just as popular theatre did in post-Revolutionary Petrograd.²¹³ Similarly, both literary and theatrical Expressionism in Germany was based on the figure of the 'New Man', who was both represented and embodied by the actor. The actor was not only valued for his ability to embody a wide range of emotional states and convey the feelings of the playwright, but also for his skill of steering the experience of the audience.²¹⁴ As has been discussed, this idea was also central to the Soviet mass spectacles of the 1920s.

Perhaps more exclusively Expressionist, however, was Radlov's interest in the actor's speech and movement. This had clearly influenced Radlov's direction since his productions at the Theatre of Popular Comedy, where 'the actor's part served as an outline for the performer's improvisation'.²¹⁵ Following this, the actor gained a new importance at Radlov's Experimental Workshop, where Radlov began to put aside his popular theatre 'eccentricity' in order to access 'the pure substance of acting, as he visualized it at the time.'²¹⁶ Radlov's vision is clearly iterated in his 1923 article 'On the Pure Elements of the Actor's Art', in which he states

²¹³ See M. Gordon, German Expressionist Acting. *The Drama Review: TDR*, 19(3) (1975a), pp.34-50

²¹⁴ Gordon, 1975a: 36

²¹⁵ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 7

²¹⁶ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 28

that dramatic productions must be based on 'the actor – from whom the play is modeled – and by no means just the word.'²¹⁷ For Radlov, the new task for the actor was to convey emotion 'in its purest, unalloyed form' to the audience, both through sound and movement.²¹⁸ Nikolai Golubentsev, a student of Radlov's, recalls how Radlov 'пытался найти театральный «философский камень» в области неких «чистых элементов» театрального действия: «чистое движение», «чистый звук», «чистая эмоция».'²¹⁹ In order to find 'чистый звук', the students would undertake a form of training:

тренировка на сочетание бессмысленной речи, заумного языка с «чистой эмоцией». [...] Помню его менторские возгласы: —
Послушайте, что вы там рассказываете? Мне не нужно смысла в вашем звучании. Вы опять нагружаете речь каким-то содержанием.
Отдавайтесь эмоции безотчетно.²²⁰

This is reminiscent of the *Geist* productions of German Expressionist theatre, which 'could be viewed as an ultimate vision of pure expression without the conventional intervention of dramatic characters or intricate plot.'²²¹ Indeed, Radlov wrote and directed two productions which

²¹⁷ See S. Radlov and L. Ball., On the Pure Elements of the Actor's Art. *The Drama Review: TDR*, 19(4) (1975), pp.117-23 (p.118)

²¹⁸ Radlov and Ball, 1975: 123

²¹⁹ See N. Golubentsev, 'Iz dnevnika aktyera' in *Vstrechi s Meierkhol'dom. Sbornik Vospominanii* (Moscow: Vserossiiskoye Teatralnoye Obshchestvo, 1967), pp.164-172 (p.165)

²²⁰ Golubentsev: 1967: 166

²²¹ Gordon, 1975a: 42

premiered in January 1923 – *Убийство Арчи Брейтона* and *Опус № 1* – both of which were wordless and based solely on movement and sound.²²²

Later, in both Radlov's Studio Theatre and his College for Stage Arts, the director would develop these ideas and concentrate on the combination of word with gesture.²²³ This would be found in, for instance, Radlov's 1925 production of Ostrovsky's *Не было ни гроша, да вдруг алтын*, and his 1928 version of Plautus' *The Twins*, productions which both involved the actors wearing masks and emphasised gesture.²²⁴ These techniques can again be traced to German Expressionist theatre, to the extent that they suffered the same pitfalls, such as extreme experimentation with forms of bodily expression leading to spoken lines being 'swallowed or lost'.²²⁵ Indeed, while the actors in Radlov's production of *The Twins* were praised for the expressiveness of their movements, their difficulties in pronouncing the text were noted by several reviewers.²²⁶ This was perhaps part of the reason for Radlov's gradual movement towards Realism in the work of his actors, particularly in the dramatic productions of his Studio in the early 1930s. For example, he explicitly claimed that it was in 1932 that he began to treat Shakespeare as a 'realist playwright' for the first time,²²⁷ and his 1933 production of Ibsen's *Ghosts* was praised for its seriousness and realism.²²⁸ It was particularly after his

²²² Zolotnitsky, 1998: 29-30

²²³ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 36, 94-95

²²⁴ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 95; 101

²²⁵ Gordon, 1975a: 46

²²⁶ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 96

²²⁷ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 102

²²⁸ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 106-7

production of *Romeo and Juliet* that Radlov began engaging with Stanislavsky's method of acting and prioritizing Realism over Expressionism.²²⁹

In the following case study of Radlova's translation of *Romeo and Juliet*, the way in which Radlova approaches the physical experience of the actor's speech in her translation will be explored. Radlova is clearly concerned with the actor's ability to convey the meaning of Shakespeare's words clearly, particularly for a working-class audience. This seems to have been influenced by Radlov's theatre experiments with Expressionism, as well as by Radlov's and Radlova's poetic work as Emotionalists between 1914 and the mid-1920s. While exhibiting both of these influences, Radlova's translation arguably adapts them to the growing demands of Socialist Realism, which aimed to excite the audience while prioritising the clarity and accessibility of an author's message.²³⁰

²²⁹ See Radlov in A. Ostrovsky, 'Shakespeare as a founding father of socialist realism: The Soviet affair with Shakespeare' in *Shakespeare in the World of Communism and Socialism* (eds. I. Makaryk, I. and J. Price) (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013), pp.56-83 (p.69)

²³⁰ Dobrenko, 2011

Radlova's translation of *Romeo and Juliet*: a case study

Radlova's translation of *Romeo and Juliet* arguably exhibits the influence of each of the theatre norms with which Radlov particularly engaged in the 1920s. The following section will analyse Radlova's work and suggest how her translation choices corresponded to Radlov's directorial interests. In addition, however, Radlova's choices were undoubtedly directed by the emerging conversation about the role of art in the 1930s, and the development of Socialist Realism. As a result, the case study will also consider how Radlov's influence was reconciled with, and may even have contributed to, the evolving demands of the culture surrounding Radlova. In many cases, these two sources of influence coincide, with 1920s theatre experimentation being put towards Socialist Realist ends.

Popular theatre as anti-Romanticism

Firstly, Radlova often approaches Shakespeare with the same rejection of Romanticism that was prevalent in the popular theatre experiments of the 1920s. Most noticeable are her treatment of potentially sentimental scenes with irreverence and her emphasised juxtaposition of the play's tragic and comic scenes. Pavel Markov, a teacher and theatre writer from the Moscow Art Theatre, recognised this correspondence in the work of Radlov and Radlova:

Радлов хотел дать "Ромео" без надоевшей оперной мишуры и лживого блеска бенгальских огней. Он хотел дать правду без мелочности быта, в строгих и законченных формах. Спектакль так и сделан — без ложной красоты, но с подлинной красотой, без приподнятой торжественности, но с побеждающей страстностью, без грустного умиления, но с протестующей силой. Конечно, молодость и темперамент исполнителей сыграли свою роль — их хорошо использовал Радлов. Конечно, много помог прекрасный перевод А. Радловой.²³¹

One way in which Radlova achieves this is through drawing attention to instances in which the words or actions of characters ought to be interpreted as overblown, thus undermining their seriousness. A clear example of this occurs at the start of the play, when Romeo laments his lack of success with Rosaline. Commenting on the production, the critic Zhezhelenko refers to this scene, noting how 'Ромео носитя с воображаемой, литературно-подражательной любовью к Розалине. И эти вздохи, эти клятвы, эти побрякушки метафор раскрыты Радловым комедийно. [...] И этот смех ничуть не вредит герою. Напротив, он роднит Ромео со зрителями, делает Ромео близким и человечны.'²³²

Radlova highlights the sentimental, learnt nature of Romeo's complaints through the addition of three exclamation marks, which break up Romeo's speech into discrete, staccato utterances. The effect is amplified by the addition of three 'и's in the final line which, along with the exclamation

²³¹ Markov in Zolotnitsky, 1992: 64-65

²³² Zhezhelenko in Zolotnitsky, 1992: 61

marks of the two final lines, bring Romeo's words to a melodramatic crescendo:

Romeo: Alas, that love, whose view is muffled still,
Should without eyes see pathways to his will.
Where shall we dine? O me, what fray was here?
Yet tell me not, for I have heard it all.
Here's much to do with hate, but more with love.
Why then, O brawling love, O loving hate,
O anything of nothing first create²³³

Ромео: Увы, любовь слепа, но и без глаз
Она ведет, куда захочет, нас! –
Где мы обедаем? Увы, был шум здесь.
Не говори мне, все уж слышал я.
Страшна нам ненависть, любовь страшнее.
О злобная любовь, о нежный враг!
О нечто и ничто, и свет, и мрак!²³⁴

Similarly, in the scene between Capulet and Tybalt at the ball, in which Capulet tries to put an end to Tybalt's protestations, Radlova again increases the antagonism of the scene, while Shakespeare seems to show more nuance. In the original, while Capulet initially lashes out at Tybalt, in his following words, after Tybalt's 'Why, uncle, 'tis a shame', Capulet regains his composure, and his exclamations, such as 'More light, more

²³³ *Romeo and Juliet*, I.i.169-175

²³⁴ Radlova, 1939

light!' and 'What, cheerly, my hearts!' show a contrast between his quiet, murmured vexation and the joviality that he presents to his guests.

Capulet: He shall be endured.
 What, goodman boy, I say he shall, go to!
 Am I the master here or you? Go to!
 You'll not endure him?
 God shall mend my soul,
 You'll make a mutiny among my guests,
 You will set cock-a-hoop,
 you'll be the man!

Tybalt: Why, uncle, 'tis a shame.

Capulet: Go to, go to,
 You are a saucy boy. Is't so indeed?
 This trick may chance to scathe you, I know what.
 You must contrary me! – Marry, 'tis time,
 Well said, my hearts. – You are a princox, go,
 Be quiet, or – More light, more light! – For shame,
 I'll make you quiet. – What, cheerly, my hearts!²³⁵

Radlova, meanwhile, has Capulet maintain his outbursts of anger throughout the exchange:

Капулетти: Терпеть заставлю!
 Молчать, мальчишка! Я сказал - заставлю!
 Кто здесь хозяин? Я иль вы? Ступайте!
 Вы "не потерпите", помилуй бог!
 Среди моих гостей устроить бунт!
 Хотите хорохориться? Посмотрим!

Тибальт: Но, дядя, это стыд!

Капулетти: Подите прочь!

²³⁵ *Romeo and Juliet*, I.v.75-87

Нахальный вы мальчишка - всем известно.
 Вам эти шутки могут повредить.
 Вы раздражаете меня! Довольно!
 Отлично сказано! - Наглец! Ступайте!
 Сидите смирно! Или... - Света! - Стыдно!
 Я усмирю вас. - Веселей, друзья!²³⁶

In addition, Radlova often highlights the interplay of the comic and the tragic through the addition of a humorous tone to otherwise serious scenes. For example, during the first meeting of Romeo and Juliet at the ball, when Romeo kisses Juliet, claiming that he is taking back his 'sin', the original text has Juliet responding with the words: 'You kiss by th' book'.²³⁷ This sentiment is retained in, for example, Bal'mont's version of the scene, in which Juliet says 'твой поцелуй – разученный урок'.²³⁸ However, in Radlova's version, it is omitted, and Juliet instead takes a more active role and tries to 'settle' the account of their sins, resulting in an almost humorous exchange:

...Верни мой грех!
 Джульетта: Нет, точный счет мне люб.
 (Целует его)²³⁹

A similar presentation of the two lovers as charming, mischievous children, can be found in the scene of Romeo and Juliet's marriage. Here,

²³⁶ Radlova, 1939

²³⁷ *Romeo and Juliet*, I.v.109

²³⁸ Bal'mont, 2011: 144

²³⁹ Radlova, 1939

Shakespeare's Friar Lawrence tells the children that they should be married quickly, since they cannot be left alone until they are husband and wife:

Come, come with me, and we will make short work,
For, by your leaves, you shall not stay alone
Till holy church incorporate two in one.²⁴⁰

Bal'mont's translation also presents this as a traditional rule that cannot be ignored:

Идём со мной и совершим все кратко.
Прошу простить, вам здесь не быть вдвоём,
пока обряд не свяжет двух в одном²⁴¹

Radlova, however, presents the Friar as personally invested in keeping the lovers, who can't be trusted, under his watchful eye, lending the scene a sense of playfulness:

Идем, скорее к делу. В плоть едину
Соединит святая церковь вас;
А до тех пор с вас не спущу я глаз.²⁴²

The juxtaposition of comedy and tragedy is closely linked to that of 'high' and 'low' content and, for instance, Juliet's Nurse is often a source of

²⁴⁰ *Romeo and Juliet*, II.vi.35-37

²⁴¹ Bal'mont, 2011: 157

²⁴² Radlova, 1939

humour throughout the play. Radlova occasionally emphasises this, for example when Shakespeare has the Nurse, overwhelmed with emotion, call out for 'aqua vitae'. In these instances, Bal'mont has the Nurse call out for 'чарку', while in Radlova's translation, the euphemism is unpacked, and the Nurse instead calls simply for 'водки', provoking a clear invitation for the audience to laugh. Examples of this can be found in Act 3, when the Nurse relays the news of Tybalt's death to Juliet:

Ah, where's my man? Give me some aqua vitae.
 These griefs, these woes, these sorrows make me old.
 Shame come to Romeo!²⁴³

Radlova's version:

Ах, где слуга мой? Водки мне скорей!
 Уж эти горести меня состарят!
 Позор Ромео!²⁴⁴

Bal'mont's version:

Где мой слуга? Хочу я чарку выпить²⁴⁵

The same occurs in Act 4, when Juliet is taken for dead:

Some aqua vitae, ho! My lord, my lady!²⁴⁶

²⁴³ *Romeo and Juliet*, III.ii.85-90

²⁴⁴ Radlova, 1939

²⁴⁵ Bal'mont, 2011: 162

²⁴⁶ *Romeo and Juliet*, IV.v.16

Radlova's version:

Ах, водки мне!.. Сударыня!.. Ах, сударь!..²⁴⁷

Bal'mont's version:

Ей, чарку мне! Синьор! Моя синьора!²⁴⁸

Interestingly, although the Nurse is a 'low' character in the play, and often provides comic relief, there is little differentiation between her language and the language of 'higher' characters in Radlova's translation. A single instance can arguably be found, when, in the first act, when the Nurse explains to Juliet that she is being called by 'Your mother' (I.iii.6). This is translated by Radlova as 'Да ваша мать', with the addition of the conjunction 'Да' adding a level of informality to the utterance. However, such indicators of status are largely absent from the translation. This is perhaps due to the fact that, in large part, Radlova attempted to neutralise the play's dialects, making the production accessible and intelligible to a mass audience.

By the 1930s, popular theatre's explicit integration into Soviet culture had largely been renounced.²⁴⁹ However, Radlova's emphasis on anti-Romanticism can be seen to reflect not only the tendencies of 1920s

²⁴⁷ Radlova, 1939

²⁴⁸ Bal'mont, 2011: 176

²⁴⁹ Kelly, 1989, 80

norms, but also the Socialist Realist preoccupation with the Renaissance. Ostrovsky notes that, in the 1930s, 'Stalin's formula 'Life has become better, comrades; life has become more joyful' reflected, as well as dictated, the mood in the country.²⁵⁰ The overwhelming atmosphere, in theatre as well as public discourse, was one of success and overcoming conflict, to the extent that, in 1936, 'Nemirovich-Danchenko expressed his apprehension about 'dark and heavy' productions without a 'relieving sigh at the finale'.²⁵¹

Indeed, this approach remained popular for several decades, with the Soviet theatre scholar Sofya Nel's presenting it in 1960 as the correct and most relevant reading of *Romeo and Juliet*. For Nel's, 'На сцене театра XIX века большие актеры воплощали глубоко трогательные образы идеальных молодых людей, погибающих по воле рока. Но эти романтические Ромео и Джульетта мало походили на тех людей эпохи Возрождения, образы которых создал великий реалист Шекспир.'²⁵² Like Radlov, Nel's sees the finale of the tragedy not as the pessimistic defeat of sinful love or the pessimistic victory of a tainted society, but a hopeful reconciliation of two households who realise the anachronistic nature of their feud: 'Ромео и Джульетта — жертвы давно отживших традиций. Поэтому и возможно, более того, внутренне необходимо примирение Монтеки и Капулетти на могиле детей. [...] Примирение

²⁵⁰ Ostrovsky, 2013: 61

²⁵¹ Ostrovsky, 2013: 61

²⁵² Nel's, 1960

Монтеки и Капулетти — символ торжества новой жизни и счастья для тех, кто сумеет любить и быть верным любви [...] Такой глубоко оптимистический смысл имеет печальная повесть о страданиях и гибели возлюбленных при правильном понимании соотношения тех противоборствующих сил, которые выступают в трагедии.²⁵³

Mass theatre as inspiration and education

Radlova's translation seems to exhibit the influence of 1920s mass theatre and circus-theatre while also showing a consciousness of emerging discussions around staging the classics. Firstly, she embraces the idea of educating and inspiring her audience through simplicity and effect, as has been achieved by the mass spectacles of the 1920s. By 1934, this immediate post-Revolutionary idea of 'life-building' through culture had evolved to serve Socialist Realist aims, particularly 'идейность' and 'народность'.²⁵⁴ Speaking at the First Writers' Congress in 1934, Zhdanov showed this in advancing Stalin's view of writers as 'engineers of human souls' and reminding the congress that 'the truthfulness and historical concreteness of the artistic portrayal should be

²⁵³ Nel's, 1960

²⁵⁴ Dobrenko, 2011

combined with the ideological remolding and education of the toiling people in the spirit of socialism.²⁵⁵

Radlova was clearly inspired by this view of art. Indeed, in her only extant article, 'О переводе', included in the programme of Radlov's 1938 production of *Hamlet*, her words seem to apply as much to her translation of *Romeo and Juliet* as to her work on *Hamlet*. She claims that one of her main priorities was to translate with 'современным русским языком, совершенно конкретным: и реалистичным, не отяжеляя его архаизмами и старинными оборотами.'²⁵⁶ For Radlova:

Если я в какой-то степени к нему приблизилась, если „Гамлет" станет для советского зрителя, для сотен тысяч и миллионов зрителей и для тысяч русских актеров не „старинным театром", не „скучным классиком", не „вольным поэтическим переложением" величайшей трагедии мира, а живым, полноценным и патетически-реалистическим произведением, какое оно и есть в подлиннике, труд мой будет не напрасен.²⁵⁷

In *Romeo and Juliet*, her attempts to achieve this are particularly noticeable in her use of simplified language and exclamations to create the effect of action and excitement that would be perceived by all members of the audience.

²⁵⁵ See A. Zhdanov, 'Soviet Literature - The Richest in Ideas, the Most Advanced Literature' [Speech delivered in August 1934 at Soviet Writers Congress] in Gorky, Radek, Bukharin, Zhdanov and others, *Soviet Writers' Congress 1934* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1977), pp.15-26

²⁵⁶ Radlova, 1938

²⁵⁷ Radlova, 1938

First, Radlova occasionally simplifies Shakespeare's language and uses repetition in order to produce a strong impression and to capture the attention of the audience. For example, in the first scene of the first act, the citizens watching the clashing houses exclaim, 'Strike! beat them down,/ Down with the Capulets, down with the Montagues!'²⁵⁸ In Bal'mont's translation, for example, the variety of cries is retained: 'Ударьте их, тузите хорошенько. / Прочь Капулетти и долой Монтеки!'²⁵⁹ Radlova, on the other hand, creates a simpler, more striking effect through repetition: 'Бей их! / Бей Капулетти! Бей Монтеки всех!'²⁶⁰ A similar instance can be found in Act 3, when Capulet shouts at Juliet, 'Out, you green-sickness carrion! Out, you baggage, / You tallow-face!'²⁶¹ Bal'mont, for instance, retains references to Juliet being 'baggage', being pale and having a face like tallow in his lines: Ты, падань бледнолицая! Ты, сало! / Ты, потаскушка!²⁶² Radlova, meanwhile, uses the striking repetition of the interjection 'Вон', and removes Shakespeare's reference to tallow, replacing it with the more memorable 'дура': 'Вон, немочь бледная! Вон, пустомеля! / Вон, дура!'²⁶³

²⁵⁸ *Romeo and Juliet*, I.i.71-2

²⁵⁹ Bal'mont, 2011: 134

²⁶⁰ Radlova, 1939

²⁶¹ *Romeo and Juliet*, III.v.156-157

²⁶² Bal'mont, 2011: 170

²⁶³ Radlova, 1939

Other examples include Radlova simply cutting out lengthy artistic passages or removing Shakespeare's intricate wordplay. When Romeo parts with Juliet, Shakespeare's text reads:

Sleep dwell upon thine eyes, peace in thy breast;
 Would I were sleep and peace, so sweet to rest.
 The grey-eyed morn smiles on the frowning night,
 Chequering the eastern clouds with streaks of light,
 And darkness, fleckled, like a drunkard reels
 From forth day's pathway made by Titan's wheels.
 Hence will I to my ghostly sire's close cell,
 His help to crave and my dear hap to tell.²⁶⁴

In Radlova's version, only the first two lines and final two lines, which move the action forwards, are kept:

Сон и покой да будут над тобою! –
 Хотел бы я быть сном тем и покоем!
 Нужна мне помощь; я к монаху в келью
 Пойду, сердечным поделюсь весельем.²⁶⁵

Another instance of this can be found in Act 1, when preparations are being made for the Capulet's ball. The first servingman complains that 'When good manners shall lie all in one or two men's hands, and they unwashed too, 'tis a foul thing.'²⁶⁶ Shakespeare here plays on the similarity of 'manners' with the Latin word for hand, 'manus', making the

²⁶⁴ *Romeo and Juliet*, II.ii.188-193

²⁶⁵ Radlova, 1939

²⁶⁶ *Romeo and Juliet*, I.v.3-5

lines mean literally: 'It is a deplorably *foul thing* that only one or two of the kitchen staff have *manners* at all and theirs are tarnished by dirty hands; since Latin for hand is 'manus', the few with *manners* have dirty manus.'²⁶⁷ While, for example, Bal'mont tries to retain this play on words, having manners held 'в руках одного человека, или двух'²⁶⁸, Radlova simplifies the lines, removing the wordplay and all references to 'manners', and replacing 'hands' with the colloquial 'paws': Плохо, когда все лежит на двух людях, да и то с немьтыми лапами.'²⁶⁹

Finally, Radlova often uses additional exclamations to create a sense of excitement and activity. For example, in Act 3, when Mercutio is wounded, the urgency of the scene is heightened through Radlova's addition of exclamation marks. In Shakespeare's text, there are only two exclamations, when Romeo calls on Tybalt and Mercutio to stop fighting a second time. This creates the impression that Romeo begins his pleas moderately before becoming desperate. The lack of exclamations in Mercutio's lines, meanwhile, signals his resignation to death:

Draw, Benvolio, beat down their weapons.
Gentlemen, for shame, forbear this outrage.
Tybalt, Mercutio, the Prince expressly hath
Forbid this bandying in Verona streets.
Hold, Tybalt! Good Mercutio!
[...]

Mercutio: I am hurt.

²⁶⁷ *Romeo and Juliet*: 166

²⁶⁸ Bal'mont, 2011: 142

²⁶⁹ Radlova, 1939

A plague a' both houses! I am sped.
Is he gone and hath nothing?²⁷⁰

In contrast, in Radlova's translation, the energy of both Romeo and Mercutio is kept at a maximum throughout their utterances, creating a scene of simple, consistent agitation:

Вперед, Бенволио! Оружье выбей! –
Стыд, господа! Насилье прекратите!
Тибальт, Меркуцио! Князь наш запретил
На улицах Вероны эти драки.
Тибальт! Меркуцио добрый!
[...]

Меркуцио: Ранен я!
Чума на ваши дома! Мне конец!
Ушел он? Невредим он?²⁷¹

While the simplicity of mass theatre remained valuable in the early 1930s, other features, particularly circus techniques and the atmosphere of entertainment, were beginning to be viewed with disapproval, and Radlova's translation also reflects this change. Particularly symbolic of this shift was the disbanding of the *Sinyaya bluza* agitprop troupe in 1932.²⁷² By this point, leading voices in Leningrad theatre were becoming wary of directors prioritising entertainment at the expense of Shakespeare's true complexity. Gvozdev, for instance, warned directors against

²⁷⁰ *Romeo and Juliet*, III.i.85-93

²⁷¹ Radlova, 1939

²⁷² Kelly, 1989: 80

‘преувеличенная «развлекательность»’ which ‘свидетельствует о явной недооценке серьезности культурных запросов массовой аудитории, громадного роста культуры массового зрителя.’²⁷³

This accusation was levelled at Radlov in 1932, with Smirnov claiming that Radlov’s *Othello* was ‘not free from some contaminations which were designed to “facilitate” the understanding of Shakespeare by the Soviet spectator: the grotesque treatment of Brabantio’s part and all Venetian Senate, the caricaturing of the comic moments, some unnecessary outward effects.’²⁷⁴ By the time of his production of *Romeo and Juliet*, Radlov was clearly aware of this movement against ‘over-entertaining’ and admitted this:

I cannot stop fearing too intellectual, somewhat vegetarian drama actors, cannot help being attracted to jugglers, riders, acrobats. For years I did all I could to forget them but was still afraid to find myself firmly established on a sofa side by side with Uncle Vanya or Oswald Alving.²⁷⁵

While Radlov was clearly struggling to renounce his previous experiments, Radlova’s translation manages to reconcile this legacy with the demands of the early 1930s. She at once engages with mass theatre norms to create an accessible, inspirational and educational script, while refraining from transforming the play into outright circus-style entertainment.

²⁷³ See A. A. Gvozdev, ‘Klassiki na sovetskoi stsene’ in *Teatral’naya Kritika* (Leningrad: Iskusstvo, 1987a), pp.121-125 (p.124)

²⁷⁴ Smirnov in Zolotnitsky, 1998: 103

²⁷⁵ Radlov in Zolotnitsky, 1998: 105

For example, it is notable that, while Radlova clearly tries to engage the audience, there are few explicit attempts to entertain the audience at the expense of Shakespeare's textual content. Instead, her translation focuses on enhancing the play's inherent humour and interactivity by drawing the audience into the play's dialogues. For example, certain comedic moments are worded in a more inclusive way than in Shakespeare's original text. In the first scene, for instance, when Juliet's mother says that in marrying Paris, Juliet will make herself 'no less,'²⁷⁶ the Nurse jokes: 'No less? Nay, bigger – women grow by men.' In Radlova's version of the joke, the Nurse says 'Какой ущерб! Мы от мужчин толстеем!', including all women in the audience in her knowing play on words. In addition, in certain instances, Radlova adds rhetorical questions, which involve the audience in the action. For example, when, in the first act, Romeo muses that 'This is not Romeo, he's some otherwhere'²⁷⁷, Radlova translates this as 'А где Ромео - кто мне даст ответ?' This use of the first person and rhetorical questions could be seen as a form of pantomime, reminiscent of popular theatre. Indeed, dating back to his productions at the Theatre of Popular Comedy, Radlov had wanted to employ a 'folk-comedy basis of communication between the actors and the audience.'²⁷⁸

²⁷⁶ *Romeo and Juliet*: I.iii.96

²⁷⁷ *Romeo and Juliet*: I.i.196

²⁷⁸ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 8

Expressionism as accessibility

Expressing pure emotion through words is one of the few areas in which it is known that Radlova took an active interest, due to her work as an Emotionalist poet. Radlov and Radlova were pivotal figures in the development of Emotionalism, whose beginnings date back to 1914 at the Radlovs' home, which became 'the meeting place for the "cream of all the arts."' ²⁷⁹ It was there that the couple met and shared ideas with Mikhail Kuzmin, the leader of the Emotionalist movement.²⁸⁰ By the early 1920s, the Emotionalists had become a fully-fledged group, with their own journal, *Abraksas*, and several manifestoes. Their central aim was to 'производить единственное, неповторимое эмоциональное действие через передачу в единственной, неповторимой форме единственного, неповторимого эмоционального восприятия.'²⁸¹ It was by this time that Radlov had begun to implement Expressionist ideas in his theatre workshops, and Radlova had written three volumes of Emotionalist poetry, an Emotionalist novella and an Emotionalist play. Thus, with Radlova's entire poetic career taking place under the influence of Emotionalism, it is unsurprising that she was attentive to the relationship between the words she was translating for the stage, the actor's experience in uttering them and the audience's experience in hearing them.

²⁷⁹ See N. Mandelstam, *Hope Abandoned* (London: Collins Harvill, 1989), p.121

²⁸⁰ Mandelstam, 1989: 120

²⁸¹ See M. Kuzmin, A. Radlova, S. Radlov, Yu. Yurkun, 'Deklaratsiya Emotsionalizma', *Abraksas* (February 1923)

For example, Radlova exhibits an Expressionistic interest in the combination of word and gesture through her use of specific sound effects or deictic words to imply a certain gesture. For instance, in the first act of the play, Romeo complains: 'Tut, I have lost myself. I am not here.'²⁸² In Radlova's translation, this 'Tut' becomes 'Шш...', creating more interaction between the actors playing Romeo and Benvolio. Later in Act 1, during the first conversation between Romeo and Juliet, Romeo says:

If I profane with my unworhiest hand
This holy shrine, the gentle sin is this:
My lips, two blushing pilgrims, ready stand
To smooth that rough touch with a tender kiss.²⁸³

In Radlova's version, the word 'my' is removed from the first and third lines. Particularly noticeable is that, instead of Romeo referring to 'My lips', he says 'Вот губы'. This immediately creates a deictic context and makes the scene more about experience of the actors onstage than the words of disembodied literary characters:

Руки коснулся грешною рукой,
На искупление право мне даруй.
Вот губы - пилигримы: грех такой
Сейчас готов смыть нежный поцелуй.²⁸⁴

²⁸² *Romeo and Juliet*, I.i.195

²⁸³ *Romeo and Juliet*, I.v.92-95

²⁸⁴ Radlova, 1939

Similarly, Radlova modifies certain lines to include more interactions, for example through the use of direct speech rather than indirect speech. In Scene 5 of Act 1, when preparations are being made for the ball. Peter says, 'let the/ porter let in Susan Grindstone, and Nell, Anthony and Potpan.'²⁸⁵ Radlova modifies this so that the final two names are called out, creating a greater sense of interactions between characters taking place onstage: 'вели привратнику пропустить Сусанну Грайндстон и Нелли. Антон! Потпен!'²⁸⁶

In addition to these apparent remnants of 1920s Expressionism, the translation also demonstrates Radlova's interest in adhering to the demands of Socialist Realism, for example to the idea of 'народность,' which required 'simplicity and comprehensibility' of art.²⁸⁷ Indeed, Radlova's translation of *Romeo and Juliet* seems to have been a turning point between her earlier interests in pure expressiveness and a later prioritisation of disseminating Shakespeare's ideas through the medium of the actor. By 1938, the balance had shifted, and the main priority was making Shakespeare's words easy for the actor, as Radlova explicitly states:

Третья задача и едва ли не самая мне дорогая: сценичность русского „Гамлета". Мне хотелось, чтобы актеру, произносящему мой текст, его актерский труд был бы радостен и легок и чтобы он мог, вжившись в

²⁸⁵ *Romeo and Juliet*: I.v.8-10

²⁸⁶ Radlova, 1939

²⁸⁷ Dobrenko, 2011

образ, произносить слова Шекспира как свои, не мучая свою память, язык и дыхание и не терзая уши зрителей книжной тяжестью стиха.²⁸⁸

By this point, Radlova was consciously moving more towards the goal of creating an idea-rich Shakespeare for the masses, even at the expense of traditional formal or artistic considerations, which were still priorities in

Romeo and Juliet:

считая эквиритмию или эквилинеарность, как ее называют некоторые критики [...] в принципе правильной, я не делаю из нее для себя фетиш, как делала в моих двух первых переводах („Отелло" и „Ромео"), когда подчинялась эквилинеарности как непреложному закону. Я считаю, что лучше „нашить" строчку, чем уступить какую-нибудь существенную черту образа или мысли Шекспира. Всякий перевод, разумеется, связан с жертвой, но важно жертвовать наименее существенным. Наименее существенным я считаю некоторые детали образов и эпитетов, требующие научного комментария, и я ими сознательно жертвую, стараясь сберечь главное: поэтическую мысль, поэтическую форму и дух Шекспира, его сценическую специфику и социальную природу, а также непревзойденную реальность и конкретность образа.²⁸⁹

Although Radlova is writing about her 1938 translation of *Hamlet*, her foregrounding of 'существенную черту образа или мысли Шекспира' and his 'сценическую специфику и социальную природу' is already present in *Romeo and Juliet*. For example, in certain complex lines, Radlova simplifies Shakespeare's imagery and language in order to make

²⁸⁸ Radlova, 1938

²⁸⁹ Radlova, 1938

lines easier for the actors to pronounce, and therefore for the audience to understand.

An example of this can be found in the third act, towards the beginning of Juliet's monologue, when she says:

Lovers can see to do their amorous rites
By their own beauties; or, if love be blind,
It best agrees with night.²⁹⁰

While Radlova retains the content of these lines, the words and punctuation she chooses make Juliet's thought more straightforward. Her developing idea becomes a logical list of statements, rather than the young girl's weaving thoughts:

Любовникам любовный их обряд
Осветит их краса. Слепа любовь.
Ей ночь милее.²⁹¹

Bal'mont's version, in contrast, preserves Juliet's daydreaming tone, but is more complex and intricate, perhaps posing difficulties for an actor:

Своею красотою освещают
Влюблённые обряд любовный свой.
Когда любовь ж слепа, всего ей лучше
Согласоваться с ночью.²⁹²

²⁹⁰ *Romeo and Juliet*, III.ii.8-10

²⁹¹ Radlova, 1939

²⁹² Bal'mont, 2011: 161

Later in the same monologue, Juliet speaks of herself as a house that has been bought but not lived in:

O, I have bought the mansion of a love
 But not possessed it, and though I am sold,
 Not yet enjoyed.²⁹³

Again, Radlova simplifies the language, using 'купить' and 'владеть' where Shakespeare purposefully alternates between 'bought' and 'sold' and 'possessed' and 'enjoyed':

Дворец любви купила я, но им
 Я не владею; и меня купили,
 Но не владеют мной.²⁹⁴

Radlova's priority seems to be the content and the ease of utterance, and therefore, the audience's understanding of the main point. Bal'mont again seems not to share this priority, instead producing a more complex re-creation of Juliet's analogy:

Я дом любви купила, но ещё
 Я в обладанье домом не вступила,
 И тот кому я продана, ещё
 Не наслаждался мной.²⁹⁵

²⁹³ *Romeo and Juliet*, III.ii. 26-28

²⁹⁴ Radlova, 1939

²⁹⁵ Bal'mont, 2011: 161

Radlova's approach was clearly complementary to Radlov's aims. According to Tamara Jacobson, who played Juliet in the production, 'Sergei Ernestovich said about our dialogue that it is to be whispered, but in such a way that each word should be heard in the last row [...] and not only the words but the feeling too. Working with the actor, Sergei Ernestovich always proceeded from him.'²⁹⁶ Radlova's choice to use more simplistic language than in Shakespeare's text clearly helped the actors achieve the level of comfort they required, both to imbue their words with feeling, and to convey this feeling to each member of the audience.

²⁹⁶ Jacobson in Zolotnitsky, 1998: 119

Radlova's *Romeo and Juliet* as a landmark translation

Radlova's translation choices in her version of *Romeo and Juliet* show how she brought a decade of theatre experimentation in line with the evolving Socialist Realist phase of Soviet culture. Moreover, they may have contributed to Socialist Realism's onstage form. After prioritising different aspects of avant-garde theatre experimentation in the 1920s following the Revolution, Radlov seems to have brought several of these together in *Romeo and Juliet*. In Radlova's translation, these interests were reconciled with the emerging demands of Socialist Realism, and Radlova's translation choices appear to have been particularly successful in helping Radlov to achieve a balance of these two sets of norms. The norms of popular theatre blended with the Renaissance spirit of Socialist Realism, while the inspiration and entertainment of mass theatre and the circus fulfilled Socialist Realism's aims of making theatre accessible.

Radlov's 1934 staging of *Romeo and Juliet* seems to have been one of the final productions in which the experimentation of the 1920s was discernible alongside elements of Socialist Realism. It was after this production that Socialist Realism began to dominate the Radlovs' productions, reflecting its increased presence and gradual entrenchment in Soviet culture more broadly. Indeed, it was in January 1936 that the campaign against 'Formalism' was initiated, with the appearance of articles denouncing Meyerhold's theatre productions, as well as Shostakovich's opera version of *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk* and his ballet

The Limpid Stream.²⁹⁷ Socialist Realism was at this time becoming increasingly more inflexible and conservative, following what Papernyy refers to as a shift from a 'Culture One' to a 'Culture Two', from 'movement, fluidity, and explosiveness, to [...] clarity, centralization of values, settling, and solidifying.'²⁹⁸

As a result, Radlov began to engage with theatrical forms that he had explicitly disowned in the 1920s. Already by 1935, Radlov was proclaiming himself a realist and an adherent to the Stanislavsky system, writing that 'expressive gestures, sharp movement, placard-style stage effects ceased to interest me as the main requirement for an actor. They were replaced by simplicity of acting style and the motivation of an actor's behaviour on stage.'²⁹⁹ Radlov's 1939 reimagining of *Romeo and Juliet*, in contrast to his 1934 version, provides the starkest example of the changing atmosphere in Soviet theatre: 'the new conventionally romantic scenery by Vladimir Kozlinsky served as a visiting card of a new treatment. The production had become more heroic. This was a response to the call of the times. *Romeo and Juliet* [...] had outgrown the 'Komsomol' age. The purity of emotions was accompanied by courage, by a determination to walk to the end of the road.'³⁰⁰ Radlova's translation, meanwhile, seems to have weathered the growing conservatism of Socialist Realism. Her translation choices, which in 1934 still evoked

²⁹⁷ See K. Clark, *Moscow: The Fourth Rome* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2011), p.211

²⁹⁸ Ostrovsky, 2013: 68

²⁹⁹ Radlov in Ostrovsky, 2013: 69

³⁰⁰ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 180

traces of their popular theatre and Expressionist origins, could be repurposed as tools for education and the promotion of a certain reading of Shakespeare. This enduring compatibility with Socialist Realism undoubtedly played a role in Radlova's translation being used in future productions and published in collections of Shakespeare translations.

As this Socialist Realist approach to Shakespeare grew more entrenched and irreversible, several commentators began to express dissatisfaction with Radlova's translations, which themselves began to inform translation norms. For example, her work was 'harshly criticized by Kornei Chukovskii' and Yuzovsky,³⁰¹ as well as by Meyerhold in his famous article 'Meyerhold against Meyerholdism,' in which he asked:

How could it happen that when our [Communist] Party was called to stage Shakespeare, there were some people who said to us: enough, in Radlov's production and Radlova's translation we have reached the norms that cannot be overstepped. And we are saying these norms are no good, because the translations are bad.'³⁰²

On the other hand, Radlova's translation was felt by others to have stood the test of Socialist Realism almost a decade later. For example, Pasternak wrote in 1940 that 'Radlova's artistic merit is the liveliness of her spoken language. She possesses an absolute scenic ear which is a true companion of a dramatic gift and without which it would have been

³⁰¹ Ostrovsky, 2013: 70, 72

³⁰² Ostrovsky, 2013: 73

impossible to convey the prosaic parts of the dialogue as she had done it.³⁰³

Radlova's success, in contrast to Bal'mont, was arguably due to her responsiveness to the changes gradually taking hold in Soviet culture in the post-Revolutionary period. This was perhaps easier for Radlova than for Bal'mont due to the fact that, as has been demonstrated, Socialist Realist theatre grew out of the preceding decade's experiments as much as it was a detached, new phase in Soviet culture. This argument has been made about Socialist Realist culture more broadly by scholars such as Groys, who aims to dispel the 'innocent avant-garde' myth, which claims that Socialist Realism was 'a purely regressive reaction to a new art that was unintelligible to the masses'.³⁰⁴ For Groys, 'Socialist realism was not created by the masses but was formulated in their name by [...] elites who had assimilated the experience of the avant-garde and been brought to socialist realism by the internal logic of the avant-garde method itself.'³⁰⁵

In the theatre specifically, as Ostrovsky notes, the growing popularity of Shakespeare was first prompted by directors' interests, and then these interests became part of the official norms: 'the taste for Shakespeare and the wave of Shakespearean productions on the Soviet stage of the 1930s was part of a certain cultural process, which, in turn, prompted

³⁰³ Zolotnitsky, 1998: 138

³⁰⁴ See B. Groys, *The Total Art of Stalinism: Avant-Garde, Aesthetic Dictatorship, and Beyond* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), p.8-9

³⁰⁵ Groys, 1992: 9

many of the ideological statements of the time.³⁰⁶ For Radlova, therefore, translating *Romeo and Juliet* was not about perfecting or synthesising pre-Revolutionary trends in order to adapt them to a new, Revolutionary context, as had been the case for Bal'mont. Instead, her formative years, both as a translator and as a poet, coincided with the decade-long post-Revolutionary search for an entirely new guiding principle. Thus, Radlova underwent her artistic development alongside and within a nascent culture, avoiding Bal'mont's struggle of reconciling older norms with the fast-changing norms of the present and future. This difference was only augmented by the fact that Radlova's development took place in Petrograd/Leningrad, the Revolutionary capital city and the centre of Revolutionary art and theatre. In contrast, Bal'mont was working on his translation while travelling between Moscow and Novogireyevo in the city's suburbs, and may therefore have felt not only spiritually detached, but also physically removed from the fervour of the Revolution.³⁰⁷

Moreover, Radlova was young and malleable. She did not simply have the post-Revolutionary decade from which to benefit, but she had only that decade from which to develop the style of her creative work. This arguably allowed her to be more open to both the changes taking place in theatre and the speed with which they were taking place. While Toury warns against automatically associating younger translators with

³⁰⁶ See A. Ostrovsky, 'Shakespeare as a founding father of socialist realism: The Soviet affair with Shakespeare' in *Shakespeare in the World of Communism and Socialism*. (Toronto, 2013), p.60

³⁰⁷ See T. Petrova, "Plenyayas zvuchnym imenem Shekspira...", *Solnechnaya Pryazha*, 5(2011)

'progressive' translation, noting that it is often new translators who, in their insecurity, translate 'according to norms which, though they may have become dated, are still considered 'respectable',³⁰⁸ it is clear that Radlova does not belong to this category. Instead, her early and continued exposure to the rapidly changing norms arguably made her comfortable with integrating them into her work. Evidently, in the 1920s and early 1930s, there were few norms that were both 'dated' and 'respectable'.

Radlov's staging went on to influence many future productions, and his approach to Shakespeare more broadly was central to Socialist Realist interpretations of Shakespeare.³⁰⁹ Radlova's translation of *Romeo and Juliet*, in particular, could be seen to embody a crossroads in Radlov's work, bringing together popular post-Revolutionary theatre experiments while foretelling the educational role that Socialist Realism was to have. This supports Clark's observation that 'in culture there are no absolute beginnings [...] The art that follows a revolution and that we, in retrospect, say defines it, is really a selection and elaboration of pre-existing tendencies.'³¹⁰ Indeed Radlov's directorial tendencies seem to have been part of a particularly cyclical process. First, they influenced Radlov's own Shakespeare productions in the early 1930s. In turn, these productions were remoulded as models for the specific aims of Socialist

³⁰⁸ Toury, 2012: 77

³⁰⁹ Zolotnitsky, 1998

³¹⁰ Clark, 1995: 122

Realist productions of Shakespeare, which Radlov himself then followed. This is exceptionally applicable to *Romeo and Juliet*, since it was being produced at the moment that Socialist Realism was gaining momentum. The production premiered in April 1934 and was being viewed and reviewed that summer, at the same time that the First Soviet Writers' Congress, at which Socialist Realism was announced as a policy, was taking place.

Conclusion

In showing how Bal'mont's and Radlova's translations of *Romeo and Juliet* were shaped by changing cultural norms, this study has demonstrated the complexity of the relationships between different cultural periods and their norms in the early years of the Soviet Union. While the mid-1910s, the years of the Civil War, the 1920s NEP period and Socialist Realism are generally, and often necessarily, seen as distinct cultural periods, many norms that were present during these periods seem to have evolved gradually, interdependently, and at different rates in different spheres of culture. In the case of Bal'mont's translation, which was completed in 1919, Bal'mont appears to have brought together norms from turn-of-the-century Symbolism and mid-1910s Neo-Realism. Meanwhile, Tairov was embracing the atmosphere of the Revolution in his productions, an approach which would become widespread in dramatic theatre only later in the 1920s, as shown by the unenthusiastic responses to his production of *Romeo and Juliet*. In Radlova's translation, which was completed in 1934, Radlova was reconciling 1920s avant-garde theatre with the evolving demands of Socialist Realism, while Radlov seems to have been more invested in previous traditions, remaining faithful to many of his earlier experiments with popular theatre and mass entertainment.

The entangled nature of these norms, and their influence on the translators' choices, is further exemplified by the fact that many of Tairov's intentions for *Romeo and Juliet* were in fact similar to those of Radlov and Radlova.

In this way, it could be argued that, despite Radlova's translation being used for a production thirteen years after Tairov's, and being subject to the influences of a very different cultural context, her version may have been well-suited to Tairov's 1921 production. From another perspective, Tairov's production, which was unappreciated in 1921, may have been as popular as Radlov's in 1934.

By using the principles of Descriptive Translation Studies to show the influence of norms in the production and reception of Bal'mont's and Radlova's two translations, this study is only a minor, though valuable, part of Toury's overarching vision for his method. Due to its limited scope and detailed analyses, this research cannot yet be used to make broader generalisations about translation or create 'laws' of translation, based on the idea that certain translation behaviour is likely to occur under certain circumstances.³¹¹ However, its extension would allow for the accumulation of a larger corpus and would provide further insights. For example, analysing other translations of *Romeo and Juliet* from the Soviet period, such as those of Shchepkina-Kupernik and Pasternak, could indicate ways in which translation practice, and specifically translations of Shakespeare, changed over the twentieth century. This would be particularly valuable if carried out in conjunction with studies of other translations of Shakespeare for the Soviet stage, particularly as many Soviet translators produced versions of more than one Shakespeare play. For example, Lozinsky and

³¹¹ Toury, 2012: 10

Pasternak translated many of the same plays by Shakespeare as Radlova, and most of these appeared in the years following her versions. Lozinsky translated three of Shakespeare's tragedies – *Othello*, *Macbeth* and *Hamlet* – all of which were also translated by Radlova. Pasternak translated seven of Shakespeare's plays after Radlova, five of which (*Othello*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Macbeth*, *Hamlet* and *Antony and Cleopatra*) were the same as those she chose to translate. Clearly, therefore, each translator saw their interpretation of the tragedies as achieving something new.

While such research might provide a greater understanding of translation norms in the ever-changing cultural landscape of the Soviet Union, it could also provide a macro-level view of translation norms across the history of Russian theatre. In fact, the current study already suggests a wider, perhaps cyclical, trend in translation norms. The Realist period of the nineteenth century, with its focus on the audience's experience of a translation, was gradually replaced by the Symbolist focus on the original author. This was then synthesised in the Neo-Realism of Tairov, which lasted until the Revolution, when it was supplanted by a return to Realist priorities, this time with the aim of educating the proletariat. Indeed, it could be argued that, as a Socialist Realist translator, Radlova's translation in a way makes a cyclical – a truly revolutionary – return to the mid-1800s, when the dominant norm for translators was to focus on the reader more than on the original author. This trend was in a way foretold by Shershenevich – and, by extension, by the foresighted Tairov – when he

claimed that even some old translations would have been more appropriate for Tairov's productions than Balmont's.³¹²

In this way, translations of Shakespeare for the Russian stage are highly compatible with the approach and aims of Toury's Descriptive Translation Studies. In future research, analysing such translations will undoubtedly serve to elucidate a relationship between Russian approaches to Shakespeare and their socio-historical settings. This study, which focuses on the translations of *Romeo and Juliet* by Bal'mont and Radlova, serves as a starting point. As the pathfinders of early Soviet translation practice, Bal'mont and Radlova will continue to be central to a full understanding of the development of translation for the Russian and Soviet stage.

³¹² Shershenevich in Lutsenko, 2019: 89

Bibliography

Andreeva-Bal'mont, E., *Vospominaniya* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo imeni Sabashnikovykh, 1997). <https://www.litmir.me/bd/?b=200372> [accessed 04/07/2020].

Aronson, G., The Tragedy of the Cosmopolite Tairov. *The Russian Review*, 11(3) (July 1952) pp.148-156.

Baer, B. J., and Olshanskaya, N., eds., *Russian writers on translation: An anthology*. (Routledge, London and New York: 2013).

Bal'mont, K., *Poeziya kak volshebstvo* (Moscow: Skorpion, 1915). [https://ru.wikisource.org/wiki/Поэзия_как_волшебство_\(Бальмонт\)/1915_\(BT\)](https://ru.wikisource.org/wiki/Поэзия_как_волшебство_(Бальмонт)/1915_(BT)) [accessed 13/07/2020].

Bal'mont, K., 'Genii vidyashevo serdtsa' in *A Homage to Shakespeare* (ed. I. Gollancz) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1916) [Kindle Edition]. www.amazon.co.uk [accessed 04/07/2020].

Bal'mont, K., 'Revolutsioner ya ili net?' in *Revolutsioner ya ili net?* (Moscow: Verf', 1918). <https://ruslit.traumlibrary.net/page/balmont-revolucioner.html> [accessed 13/07/2020].

Bal'mont, K., Krovavye Iguny. *Volya Rossii*, 209 (22nd May 1921), p.4-5 in R. Bird and E. Ivanova, *Byl li vinoven Bal'mont? Russkaya literatura*, 3 (2004), pp.55-85 (pp.76-80).

Bal'mont, K., *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomach* (vol.1) (Moscow: Knigovek, 2010).

Bal'mont, K., 'Chustvo lichnosti v poezii' in *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomach* (vol.6) (Moscow: Knigovek, 2010a), pp.289-303.

Bal'mont, K., 'Kal'deronovskaya drama lichnosti' in *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomach* (vol.6) (Moscow: Knigovek, 2010b), pp.304-320.

Bal'mont, K., 'O russkikh poetakh' in *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomach* (vol.6) (Moscow: Knigovek, 2010c), pp.332-347.

Bal'mont, K., 'Elementarnye slova o simvolisticheskoi poezii' in *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomach* (vol.6) (Moscow: Knigovek, 2010d), pp.348-368.

Bal'mont, K., 'Pevets lichnosti i zhizni' in *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomach* (vol.6) (Moscow: Knigovek, 2010e), pp.519-535.

Bal'mont, K., 'Slovo o Kalidase' in *Izbrannoe: Stukhotvoreniya. Perevody. Stat'i*. (Moscow: Pravda, 1990).

http://az.lib.ru/b/balxmont_k_d/text_0590-1.shtml [accessed 04/07/2020].

Bal'mont, K., 'Uilyam Shekspir. Tragediya "Romeo i Dzul'etta". Perevod s angliskovo K. D. Bal'monta. Publikatsiya T. V. Petrovoi. *Solnechnaya Pryazha*, 5 (2011), pp.132-186.

Beach, J. W., Shakespeare and Harlequin. *The Virginia Quarterly Review*, 1(2) (1935), pp.247-260.

Bird, R. and E. Ivanova, Byl li vinoven Bal'mont? *Russkaya literatura*, 3 (2004), pp.55-85.

Briusov, V. 'Against Naturalism in the Theatre' (1902) in Green, M., ed., *The Russian Symbolist Theatre: An Anthology of Plays and Critical Texts*. (Michigan: Ardis, 1986), pp.24-31.

Briusov, V., 'A Few Reflection on Translating Horace's *Odes* into Russian Verse' (1916) in Baer and Olshanskaya, (eds.), *Russian writers on translation: An anthology* (Routledge, London and New York: 2013), pp.69-71.

Brodie, G., *The Translator on Stage* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017). <http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2094/10.5040/9781501322143.ch-005> [accessed 30/06/2020].

Briusov, V., 'On the Translation of Virgil's *Aeneid*' (1920) in Baer and Olshanskaya, (eds.), *Russian writers on translation: An anthology* (Routledge: London and New York, 2013), pp.71-73.

Carter, H., *The New Theatre and Cinema of Soviet Russia* (London: Chapman and Dodd, 1924).

<https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015008289491> [accessed 11/07/2020].

Clark, K., *Moscow, the Fourth Rome* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2011).

Clark, K., *Petersburg, Crucible of Cultural Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995).

Deák, F., Russian Mass Spectacles. *The Drama Review: TDR*, 19(2) (1975), pp.7-22.

Dobrenko, E., 'Socialist Realism' in *The Cambridge Companion to Twentieth-Century Russian Literature* (eds. E. Dobrenko and M. Balina) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp.97-113.

<https://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2186/docview/2137995769>

[accessed 30/06/20].

Dobrenko, E., *Aesthetics of Alienation: Reassessment of Early Soviet Cultural Theories* (trans. J. Savage) (Northwestern University Press: Evanston, 2005).

Driver, S., Acmeism. *The Slavic and East European Journal*, 12(2) (1968), 141-156.

Efros, A. and H. L. Gordon, The Russian Theatre and Its Artists since the Revolution. *Parnassus*, 1(2) (Feb. 15, 1929), pp.6-9.

Golovashenko, Yu., 'Kratkaya letopis' zhizni i tvorchestva' in Tairov, A., *O teatre* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshestvo, 1970a), pp.505-535.

Golovashenko, Yu., 'O khudozhestvennykh vzglyadach Tairova' in Tairov, A., *O teatre* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshestvo, 1970), pp.42-64.

Golubentsev, N., 'Iz denvnika aktyera' in *Vstrechi s Meyerholdom. Sbornik Vospominanii* (Moscow: Vserossiiskoye Teatralnoye Obschestvo, 1967), pp.164-172. <http://www.teatr-lib.ru/Library/Mejerhold/vstrechi/> [accessed 01/05/2020].

Gordon, M., German Expressionist Acting. *The Drama Review: TDR*, 19(3) (1975a), pp.34-50.

Gordon, M., Radlov's Theatre of Popular Comedy. *The Drama Review: TDR*, 19(4) (1975), pp.113-116.

Green, M., ed., *The Russian Symbolist Theatre: An Anthology of Plays and Critical Texts*. (Michigan: Ardis, 1986).

Green, M., *The Russian Symbolist Theater: Some Connections. Pacific Coast Philology*, 12 (1977), pp.5–14.

Grigoriev, A. 'Naiprevoshodneishaya i prezhlostnaya tragediya Romeo i Dzhul'etta. V piati deistviakh' in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii Shekspira* (vol.1) (ed. S. Vengerov) (St Petersburg: Brokgaus-Efron, 1902). [https://ru.wikisource.org/wiki/Ромео_и_Джюльетта_\(Шекспир;_Григорьев\)/1902_\(ДО\)](https://ru.wikisource.org/wiki/Ромео_и_Джюльетта_(Шекспир;_Григорьев)/1902_(ДО)) [accessed 04/07/2020].

Gripich, A., 'Uchitel' stseny' in *Vstrechi s Meyerholdom. Sbornik Vospominanii* (Moscow: Vserossiiskoye Teatralnoye Obshchestvo, 1967), pp.114-145. <http://www.teatr-lib.ru/Library/Mejerhold/vstrechi/> [accessed 01/05/2020].

Groys, B., *The Total Art of Stalinism: Avant-Garde, Aesthetic Dictatorship, and Beyond* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

Gumilev, N., 'Poetic Translations' (1919) in Baer and Olshanskaya, (eds.), *Russian writers on translation: An anthology* (Routledge: London and New York, 2013), pp.95-98.

Gvozdev, A. A., 'Klassiki na sovetskoi stsene' in *Teatral'naya Kritika* (Leningrad: Iskusstvo, 1987a), pp.121-125. <http://teatr-lib.ru/Library/Gvozdev/critic/> [accessed 12/05/2020].

Gvozdev, A. A., 'Realizm i dostizheniya revolyutsionnogo teatra' in *Teatral'naya Kritika* (Leningrad: Iskusstvo, 1987), pp.56-60. <http://teatr-lib.ru/Library/Gvozdev/critic/> [accessed 12/05/2020].

Heylen, R., *Translation, Poetics, and the Stage. Six French Hamlets* (London: Routledge, 2014). <https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=JTVHBAAAQBAJ> [accessed 13/07/2020].

Johnston, D., 'Metaphor and Metonymy: the Translator-Practitioner's Visibility' in *Staging and Performing Translation* (eds. R. Baines, C. Marinetti, M. Perteghella) (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp.11-30.

Kelly, C., 'Petrushka and the Pioneers: The Russian Carnival Puppet Theatre after the Revolution' in *Discontinuous Discourses in Modern Russian Literature* (eds. C. Kelly, M. Makin, D. Shepherd) (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1989), pp.73-111.

Koonen, A., 'Moi shekspirovskiye roli' in *Shekspirovskiy sbornik* (1958). <http://www.w-shakespeare.ru/library/shekspirovskiy-sbornik.html> [accessed 16/06/2020].

Koonen, A., *Stranitsy zhizni* (Iskusstvo: Moscow, 1985). http://teatr-lib.ru/Library/Koonen/Stranitsy_zhizni/ [accessed 16/06/2020].

Kuzmin, M., Radlova, A., Radlov, S., Yurkun, Yu., 'Deklaratsiya Emotsionalizma', *Abraksas* (February 1923). <https://ruslit.traumlibrary.net/book/sbornik-literaturnie-manifesty/sbornik-literaturnie-manifesty.html#work015001> [accessed 10/06/2020].

Leach, R., 'Futurism and Revolution' in *Russian Futurist Theatre: Theory and Practice* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2018), pp.47-76.

Lefevere, A., and S. Bassnett (eds.), *Translation, History and Culture* (London: Pinter, 1990).

Lunacharsky, A., 'Ob Aleksandre Nikolaeviche Ostrovskom i po povodu evo in *Literaturnye siluety* (Moscow, 1925), pp.33-44. <http://lunacharsky.newgod.su/lib/ss-tom-1/ob-aleksandre-nikolaeviche-ostrovskom-i-po-povodu-ego/> [accessed 21/05/2020].

Lutsenko, E., 'Perevodcheskoe fiasko K. D. Bal'monta: Chernovaya redaktsiya "Romeo i Dzhul'etty" U. Shekspira', *Shagi*, 5(3) (2019), pp.84-102.

Mandelstam, N., *Hope Abandoned* (trans. Max Hayward) (London: Collins Harvill, 1989).

Mandelstam, O., *Shum vremeni* (Moscow: Olma-Press, 2003). <https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=QPrx037ht4EC> [accessed 06/07/2020].

Markov, P. 'O Tairove' in Tairov, A. Y., *Zapiski rezhisyera* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshestvo, 1970), pp.9-41.

Metz, E., 'Konstantin Bal'mont's Oxford Lectures on Russian "Fin de Siècle" Poetry: Publication, Introduction and Comments', *Slavonic and East European Review*, 87(1), (2009), pp.78-99.

Mikhailovsky, D., *Vil'yam Shekspir. Romeo i Dzhul'etta* (perevod D. L. Mikhailovskovo) (St Petersburg: Kristall, 2001).

http://lib.ru/SHAKESPEARE/shks_romeo3.txt_Ascii.txt [accessed 04/07/2020.]

Nel's, S., 'Romeo i Dzhul'etta: Optimisticheskaya tragediya' in *Shekspir na sovetskoy stsene* (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1960a), pp.93-104. <http://www.w-shakespeare.ru/library/shekspir-na-sovetskoy-scene3.html> [accessed 23/05/2020].

Ordóñez, I., Theatre Translation Studies: An overview of a burgeoning field (Part I: Up to the early 2000s). *Status Quaestionis*, 2(5) (2013), pp.90-129.

Ostrovsky, A., 'Shakespeare as a founding father of socialist realism: The Soviet affair with Shakespeare' in *Shakespeare in the World of Communism and Socialism* (eds. I. Makaryk, I. and J. Price) (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013), pp.56-83.

Peterson, R., *History of Russian Symbolism* (Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1993).
<http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/oxford/detail.action?docID=799783> [accessed 08/07/2020].

Petrova, T., "Plenyayas zvuchnym imenem Shekspira...", *Solnechnaya Pryazha*, 5 (2011).

Piotrovsky, A., "'Romeo i Dzhul'etta" v Teatre-studii p/r S. E. Radlova' (1934) in *Teatr. Kino. Zhizn'*. (Leningrad: Iskusstvo, 1969), pp.117-120.

Ploix, C., *Translating Molière for the English-speaking Stage: The Role of Verse and Rhyme*. (London: Routledge, 2020).

<https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=B9HgDwAAQBAJ> [accessed 14/07/2020].

Polyakov (Litovtsev), S., O poete Bal'monte. *Posledniye novosti*, 169 (10th November 1920), p.3 in R. Bird and E. Ivanova, Byl li vinoven Bal'mont? *Russkaya literatura*, 3 (2004), pp.55-85 (pp.81-82).

Pyman, A., 'Russian Symbolism acquires a name. Bal'mont, Briusov, Dobroliubov and Konevskoi (1894–1900)' in *A History of Russian Symbolism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp.56-90.

Radlov, S., and L. Ball., On the Pure Elements of the Actor's Art. *The Drama Review: TDR*, 19(4) (1975), pp.117-23.

Radlova, A., 'Vil'yam Shekspir. Romeo i Dzhul'etta (per. A. Radlovoi)' in *Vil'yam Shekspir. Izbrannye proizvedeniya* (Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaya literature, 1939).
http://lib.ru/SHAKESPEARE/shks_romeo8.txt [accessed 04/07/2020].

Radlova. A., 'O perevode' in *Gamlet* (Leningrad, 1938). <https://oleg-devyatkin.livejournal.com/115203.html> [accessed 02/06/2020].

Read, C. *Culture and Power in Revolutionary Russia* (London: Macmillan, 1990).

Rudnitsky, K., *Russian and Soviet Theatre: Tradition and the Avant-garde* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2000).

Shakespeare, W. (ed. René Weis) *Romeo and Juliet (Arden Shakespeare Third Series)* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2012).

Shklovsky, V. *Sobranie sochinenii: Tom 1. Revolyutsiya* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2018).

Sundaram, S., 'Translating India, constructing self: Konstantin Bal'mont's India as image and ideal in Fin-de-siècle Russia' in Baer, B. J. (ed.), *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts: Literary translation in Eastern Europe and Russia* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2011), pp.97-115.

Tairov, A., "'Romeo i Dzhul'etta'" (1921) in *O teatre (Rezhisyerskie eksplikatsii)* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshestvo, 1970), p. 284-291.

Tairov, A., 'Kak ya rabotayu nad klassikami' in *O teatre (Ob iskusstve teatra)* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshestvo, 1970f), pp.240-242.

Tairov, A., 'Lektsii: 2 yanvarya 1931 g.' in *O teatre (Ob iskusstve teatra)* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshestvo, 1970e), pp.195-208.

Tairov, A., 'Muzyka v teatre' in *O teatre (Zapiski rezhisyera)* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshestvo, 1970b), pp.153-155.

- Tairov, A., 'Pro Domo Sua' in *O teatre (Zapiski rezhisyera)* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshestvo, 1970), pp.77-106.
- Tairov, A., 'Rol' literatury v teatre' in *O teatre (Zapiski rezhisyera)* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshestvo, 1970a), pp.145-151.
- Tairov, A., 'Stsenicheskaya atmosfera' in *O teatre (Zapiski rezhisyera)* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshestvo, 1970c), pp.157-173.
- Tairov, A., 'Teatr i dramaturg' in *O teatre (Ob iskusstve teatra)* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshestvo, 1970g), pp.255-264.
- Tairov, A., 'Zritel'' in *O teatre (Zapiski rezhisyera)* (ed. P. Markov), (Moscow: Vserossiyskoe teatralnoe obshestvo, 1970d), pp.181-192.
- Tihanov, G. (ed.), *Gustav Shpet's Contribution to Philosophy and Cultural Theory* (Indiana: Purdue University Press, 2009).
<https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=C9XtV61Isj8C> [accessed 21/06/2020].
- Tolmacheva, O., Khudozhestvennaya sistema E I Zamyatina: k voprosu ob universal'nosti. *Vestnik Tambovskovo universiteta. Seriya: Gumanitarnye nauki.* 2 (2012).
- Toury, G., *Descriptive Translation Studies – and beyond* (Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2012).
- Trotsky, L. (ed. W. Keach), *Literature and Revolution* (Chicago, Illinois: Haymarket Books, 2005).
- Warren, J., Acculturating Shakespeare: The Tactics of Translating His Works Under Stalin in the Light of Recent Theoretical Advances in Translation Studies. (Unpublished PhD thesis: The University of Nottingham, 2015). <https://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2186/docview/1780275273?accountid=13042> [accessed 05/05/2020].
- Warren, J., Rewriting Othello for the Stalinist Stage: The Case of Sergei and Anna Radlov. *Working Papers in the Humanities, MHRA*, 11 (2017), pp.17-29.

Zamyatin, E., 'O sintetizme' in *Sochineniya* (Moscow: Kniga, 1988).
http://az.lib.ru/z/zamjatin_e_i/text_1922_o_sintetizme.shtml [accessed 01/05/2020].

Zhdanov A. A., 'Soviet Literature - The Richest in Ideas, the Most Advanced Literature'. [Speech delivered in August 1934 at Soviet Writers Congress] in Gorky, Radek, Bukharin, Zhdanov and others, *Soviet Writers' Congress 1934* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1977), pp.15-26.
https://www.marxists.org/subject/art/lit_crit/sovietwritercongress/zhdanov.htm [accessed 10/06/2020].

Zolotnitsky, D. (ed.), *V sporakh o teatre: sbornik nauchnykh trudov* (St Petersburg, 1992). http://teatr-lib.ru/Library/V_sporah/1992/ [accessed 13/05/2020].

Zolotnitsky, D., *Sergei Radlov: The Shakespearian Fate of a Soviet Director* (Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1998).