

## Serge Minskevich

National Academy of Sciences of Belarus, Minsk (Belarus)

Email: minatawr@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6185-0936>

### ***Emotion and Rationality in Belarusian Sonnet Writing – on the Example of the Crown of Sonnets Śviataja studnia by Jan Čykvín and the Translations of Sonety krymskie by Adam Mickiewicz into Belarusian***

*Emocio i racio w sonetystyce białoruskiej – na przykładzie wieńca sonetów Jana Czykwina Świataja studnia i tłumaczeń Sonetów krymskich Adama Mickiewicza na język białoruski*

*Эмоцыя і рацыя ў беларускай санетыстыцы – на прыкладзе вянка санетаў Яна Чыквіна Святая Студня і перакладаў Крымскіх санетаў Адама Міцкевіча на беларускую мову*

#### **Abstract**

The article deals with two directions of development in Belarusian sonnet writing; the first, named according to its initiator – *kupalaŭski* (Kupala's), includes free sonnets; the second, named – *bahdanovičaŭski* (Bahdanovič's), includes sonnets according to the classical canon. The author of this article draws attention to the fact that the sonnet, as a kind of verse, holds an important place in Belarusian poetry of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and is still relevant today. Belarusian poets, however, often deliberately do not keep to strict sonnet rules: *emotion* in such works prevails over *rationality*. With the help of the comparative method it investigates the form and content of the crown of sonnets *Śviataja studnia* (The Holy Well) by Jan Čykvín compared with the translations of *Sonety krymskie* (Crimean Sonnets) by Adam Mickiewicz into Belarusian as well as similar works by some Belarusian authors (the crown of sonnets *Narač* (Lake Narač) by Nil Hilievič, and the crown of sonnets *Apakalipsis dušy* (Apocalypse of the Soul) by Žmitrok Marozaŭ). The author of this article considers separately the rhythmic structure of the sonnets in *Śviataja studnia* and the translations of *Sonety krymskie*. It is shown how the irregular rhythmic structure of the free sonnets creates additional levels of perception of the text. The article concludes that the two directions in Belarusian sonnet writing survived in parallel throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century and continued into the 21<sup>st</sup>. And if the first direction (emotionally determined) dominated at the beginning, the second direction (rationally determined), at the current stage of the Belarusian literary process, has expanded significantly in the work of Belarusian authors.

**Key words:** sonnet, crown of sonnets, rhythmic structure, literary process, translation

### Abstrakt

W artykule zostały omówione dwa nurty rozwoju białoruskiej sonetystryki: nurt klasyczny zainicjowany przez Maksima Bahdanowicza (tzw. nurt bahdanowiczowski) oraz nurt awangardowy zapoczątkowany przez Jankę Kupałę (tzw. nurt kupałowski). Autor podkreśla, że sonet jako gatunek literacki zajmuje ważne miejsce w poezji białoruskiej XX w. i jest wykorzystywany również współcześnie. Białoruscy poeci często świadomie nie przestrzegali zasad kompozycyjnych sonetu, ponadto preferowali opisy własnych stanów emocjonalnych, elementy racjonalne odsuwając na dalszy plan. Dzięki zastosowaniu metody komparatystycznej analizie poddano formę i treść: cyklu sonetów *Święta studnia* (*Святая студня*), przekładów *Sonetów krymskich* Adama Mickiewicza na język białoruski oraz podobnych utworów poetów białoruskich (cyklu sonetów *Narocz* (*Нарач*) Nila Hilewicza oraz *Apokalipsy duszy* Zmitroka Marozaua). Dokonano również analizy sposobu rytmizowania cyklu sonetów *Święta studnia* Jana Czykwina oraz przekładu *Sonetów krymskich*. Wskazano, że nieregularne rytmy sonetów wolnych pozwalają na wieloaspektową interpretację tekstu. W artykule udowodniono, że omówione nurty rozwojowe sonetystryki współistniały w XX w. i funkcjonują w naszych czasach. O ile jednak w twórczości autorów białoruskich początkowo dominował nurt awangardowy, o tyle obecnie obserwujemy powrót do sonetu w jego klasycznej formie.

**Słowa kluczowe:** sonet, cykl sonetów, struktura rytmizowana, proces literacki, przekład literacki

### Анотацыя

У артыкуле разглядаюцца два кірункі развіцця беларускай санетыстыкі; да першага, названага паводле яго ініцыятара *купаляўскім*, належаць вольныя санеты, да другога, названага – *багдановічаўскім* – санеты, створаныя паводле класічнага канона. Аўтар артыкула звяртае ўвагу на тое, што санет як від верша займае важнае месца ў беларускай паэзіі XX ст. і дагэтуль з’яўляецца актуальным. Аднак беларускія паэты часта свядома не прытрымліваюцца строгіх правіл санета, эмацыянальнае ў такім творы пераважае над рацыянальным. Пры дапамозе кампаратывісцкага метаду даследуюцца форма і змест вянка санетаў *Святая студня* ў супастаўленні з перакладамі *Крымскіх санетаў* Адама Міцкевіча на беларускую мову, а таксама з падобнымі творами беларускіх паэтаў (вянок санетаў *Нарач* Ніла Гілевіча, вянком вянкаў санетаў *Апакаліпсіс душы* Змітрака Марозава). Асобна разглядаецца рытмічная структура вянка санетаў *Святая студня* Яна Чыквіна і перакладаў *Крымскіх санетаў*. Паказана, як іррэгулярная рытмічная структура ў вольных санетах утварае дадатковыя сэнсавыя ўзроўні ўспрыняцця тэксту. У артыкуле сцвярджаецца, што гэтыя два кірункі ў беларускай санетыстыцы паралельна праіснавалі на працягу ўсяго XX ст. і перайшлі ў XXI ст. І калі напачатку дамінаваў першы (*эмоцыя дэтэрмінаваны*), то на сучасным этапе беларускага літаратурнага працэсу другі (*рацыя дэтэрмінаваны*) значна расшырыў свае пазіцыі ў творчасці беларускіх аўтараў.

**Ключавыя словы:** санет, вянком санетаў, рытмічная структура, літаратурны працэс, пераклад

In 1913 the newspaper *Naša Niva* started up a discussion about the development of Belarusian literature. It began with articles by Vaclaŭ Lastoŭski *Splačvajcie doŭh* (Pay the Debt) and Janka Kupala *Čamu plača pieśnia naša* (Why our Song Weeps). The first one published his article under the pseudonym Jury Vieraščaka, and in his publication he argued that the Belarusian needed its own literature with ‘European standards’ to reveal the beauty of his country ‘without sadness and weeping’, as Belarusian literature had, in fact, focused mainly on social problems. The author cited poems of similar subjects by Janka Kupala and Jakub Kolas. He urged that the reader should have in his language not only the minor-pessimistic, but also the *beauty* – the beautifully-abstract. One of ‘the Parnassians’, as Janka Kupala signed his article, answered the publication by Jury Veraščaka. In it, the poet drew attention to the fact that first you need to awaken the consciousness of Belarusians, otherwise it would be difficult to attract them to *beauty*. The discussion, which was joined by other writers and critics, and which left a noticeable mark on the history of the national literature, made it obvious that at that time the Belarusian literary process developed in two parallel ways.

This state of things in the article *Two ways of Development of Belarusian Poetry (Maksim Bahdanovič and Janka Kupala)* is thoroughly examined by Jan Čykvín who discusses the origins of those ways:

У XIX ст. беларуская адраджэнская літаратура раздзялілася, як бы натуральна выкарыстоўваючы падвойную прыроду мастацтва і ўплывы творчых напрацовак суседніх літаратур, ужо больш развітых, на шлях *верхні*, выразнікам, якога прынята лічыць Вінцэнта Дуніна-Марцінкевіча, і шлях *нізавы*<sup>1</sup>, на якім разгоргталася самабытная творчасць „народнага адваката” Францішка Багушэвіча...<sup>2</sup> (Čykvín, 2005, p. 9).

Frańcišak Bahuševič in the famous Preface to his collection of poems *Dudka Biełaruskaja* (The Belarusian Pipe), with the call ‘Do not leave our Belarusian language, so as not to die!’, on the one hand, gives Belarus an example of the revival of other European peoples; on the other hand, being within the Belarusian cultural space, initiates this revival and, in a certain way, draws a vector of interest of public opinion in the direction of the social condition of Belarusians. Undoubtedly, this opinion was supported by the majority of Belarusian writers of the late 19<sup>th</sup> – early-twentieth centuries.

Jan Čykvín on this occasion notes:

<sup>1</sup> The concepts of ‘upper’ and ‘lower’ were introduced by Adam Babareka (Babarėka, 1927, p. 139).

<sup>2</sup> ‘In the 19<sup>th</sup> century the renaissance of Belarusian literature was divided, as if naturally, using the dual nature of art and the influence of creative developments of already more developed neighboring literatures on the *верхні* (upper) way, the representative of which is considered to be Vincent Dunin-Marcinkievič, and the *нізавы* (lower) way, on which unfolded the original work of the ‘people’s advocate’ Frańcišak Bahuševič...’.

З прычыны гістарычна склаўшыся палітычных і сацыяльных абставін у Беларусі большы грамадскі рэзананс, сапраўды, меў той варыянт творчасці, які браў на сябе ролю абаронцы пакрыўджанага простага людзю, сялянства, і прамаўляў ад ягонага імя або – крыху пазней – непасрэдна ягоным голасам<sup>3</sup> (Ўквін, 2005, р. 9–10)<sup>4</sup>.

In fact, an emotional poetic work in defence of the destitute, a work-protest, a work-appeal – attracts the attention of the public more than, for example, a lyric or landscape-elegiac work with a quiet intonation. And although Jan Ŭkvin notes: ‘Дапаўняючы адзін другога, прадстаўнікі “верхняга” і “нізавога” шляхоў сваімі творамі цалкам запоўнілі ідэйны ды мастацкі тагачасны перадсвятальны гарызонт беларускай літаратуры’<sup>5</sup> (Ўквін, 2005, р. 10); yet, it can be noted that the representatives of the second (‘lower’) way in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century were more audible.

And so it was until Maksim Bahdanovič came into Belarusian literature – a creative artist with different views on the cultural space of Belarusians. Evidently his vector pointed ahead – through the social into the non-social, into the spheres where the elusive-ephemeral was born, which caused a sense of admiration for the beautiful. And at the same time, as the poet pointed out, this feeling could be formed with the help of the Belarusian language and literature. However, *Naša Niva* did not want to print a significant number of poems by Maksim Bahdanovič. This situation was aptly described by Michaś Straľcoŭ in his essay *Response to a Questionnaire*:

А як было з Багдановічам? Заўзятыя прыхільнікі нашаніўскай традыцыі, што так старанна перапявалі Купалу і Коласа, не маглі дараваць паэту, што ён спявае не так, як яны, і нават не так (якое злачынства!) як Купала і Колас. Але тое, што ў вялікіх паэтаў было паэзіяй, у іхніх эпігонаў рабілася модай, нягледзячы на ўсю асцярожнасць, з якой гэта слова трэба ўжываць у дачыненні да шчырай, самаахвярнай нашай паэзіі таго часу<sup>6</sup> (Straľcoŭ, 1966).

Jan Ŭkvin is more reserved:

<sup>3</sup> ‘In view of the historical political and social circumstances in Belarus, a greater public resonance, indeed, had assumed the form of creativity, which took on the role of defender of the abused common people, the peasantry, and spoke on their behalf or – a little later – directly with their voice’.

<sup>4</sup> ‘In view of the historical political and social circumstances in Belarus, a greater public resonance, indeed, had assumed the form of creativity, which took on the role of defender of the abused common people, the peasantry, and spoke on their behalf or – a little later – directly with their voice’.

<sup>5</sup> ‘Complementing each other, the representatives of the ‘upper’ and ‘lower’ ways completely filled with their works the ideological and artistic horizon of Belarusian literature at that time’.

<sup>6</sup> ‘And what about Bahdanovič? Ardent admirers of the *Naša Niva* tradition, that so carefully covered the works of Kupala and Kolas, could not forgive the poet, that he sings not in the same way as they, and even not like (what a crime!) Kupala and Kolas. But the poetry of the great poets became the fashion among their epigones, despite the caution with which the word must be applied to the sincere, selfless poetry of our time’.

У 1906–1908 гадах вакол „Нашай Нівы” ўжо гуртаваліся ў большасці непрафесіянальныя сялянска-народніцкія паэты, для каго нізкая беларуская рэчаіснасць, сялянскі побыт, цяжкая доля сталіся ледзь не адзіным прадметам эстэтычнага перажывання і апісвання. Сярод гэтых твораў віднае месца рашуча заваёўваў Купала, аўтар *Жалейкі* (1908 г.). Ягоны голас у „Нашай Ніве” гучаў штораз часцей і гучней ды запаўняў сабою, здавалася, усю прастору<sup>7</sup> (Цыквін, 2005, р. 13).

It becomes clear that it was almost impossible for Bahdanovič's voice to break through from the midst of that 'singing / re-singing'. The editorial secretary Jadvihin Š. stigmatized his poems as 'decadence', and the editor-in-chief Aliaksandr Ulasaŭ crossed out a notebook with Bahdanovič's works with a blue pencil and gave the disappointing verdict – 'into the archive'. Only thanks to Siarhiej Palujan, who a few months later still read those poems and defended them first before Jadvigina Š., and then before the "upper" chamber of the editorial board, that they saw the light. Obviously to do this Siarhiej Palujan had to make a lot of effort, as can be seen from the memoirs of V. Lastoŭski, which were published by Vasil' De-ĕm:

Да „верхняй” палаты належалі: А. Уласаў, браты Луцкевічы. „Ніжняй” палата складалася з Ядвігіна Ш., Купалы, Ластоўскага і Палуяна (...) Рэдакцыя ў цэлым ніколі не сходзілася. (...) Паміж сабою працаўнікі гэтых дзвюх „палат” рэдка сустракаліся; у тэхнічных справах рэдакцыі зносіліся праз замкнутыя на ключ дзверы па шчэлцы над парогам. Праз гэту шчэлку перасылаліся туды і назад рэдакцыйныя матэрыялы і карэспандэнцыя. Ясна, што пры такім падзеле „верхняй” і „ніжняй” палаты думалі парознаму, жылі рознымі ідэаламі, насілі ў сабе зародкі розных кірункаў нацыянальнай мыслі<sup>8</sup> (Vasil' De-ĕm, 2016).

One can only imagine how Siarhiej Palujan defended and gave life to the works of Maksim Bahdanovič, and what he wrote in the papers that he put in the crack under the door leading to the 'upper' chamber ...

<sup>7</sup> 'In the years 1906–1908 around *Naša Niva* mostly unprofessional peasant-populist poets had already grouped, for whom the low Belarusian reality, peasant life, heavy destiny became almost the only subject of aesthetic experience and description. Among these writers a noticeable place was decisively won by Kupala, the author of *Žaliejka* (1908). His voice in *Naša Niva* sounded every time more often and louder and seemed to fill the whole space'.

<sup>8</sup> 'To the "upper" house belonged A. Ulasaŭ and the Luckievič brothers. The "lower" house consisted of Jadvihin Š., Kupala, Lastoŭski and Palujan [...] In general the two editorial groups did not come together [...] The workers of these two "houses" rarely met; on technical matters the groups connected with each other through a little gap beneath a locked door. Through this little gap were passed back and forth editorial materials and correspondence. It is clear that with this division, the "upper" and "lower" houses thought differently, lived by different ideals, and bore in themselves the germs of various directions for national thought'.

After the publication of the poetic and literary works of Maksim Bahdanovič – one way of ‘poetization’ became associated with his name, and the other, with Janka Kupala. The above mentioned subtitle of the article by Jan Čykvín: *Two ways of Development of Belarusian Poetry (Maksim Bahdanovič and Janka Kupala)* clearly testifies to this.

The same division into two ways – that of Bahdanovič and Kupala – is observed in the Belarusian versification system, especially with regard to the Belarusian sonnet. For example, it was noted (and called ‘Kupala’s way’ and ‘Bahdanovič’s way’) by Viačaslaŭ Rahojsa (Ragojsa, 2002, p. 199).

Halina Sinila aptly reveals the essence of Maksim Bahdanovič’s poetic preferences:

Паэт – нерв, зрок і слых свайго часу... той, хто супрацьстаіць зменлівасці і энтрапіі, хто надае сапраўдную форму кавалку грубага жыцця. Можа таму такім вялікім было прыцягненне паэта (М. Багдановіча – С.М.) да вельмі строгах, крыштальна цвёрдых форм паэзіі, – форм, якія патрабуюць філіграннай, ювелірнай апрацоўкі<sup>9</sup> (Sinila, 1993, p. 47).

The pen of M. Bahdanovič created new at that time Belarusian poetic forms: triolet, rondo, rondels, ottava and terza rimma, and sonnet, which were created to a ‘European standard’. In a letter to the editor of the almanac *Maladaja Bielaruś* dated 27 November 1911, the poet explains that he was interested in classical forms of poetry: ‘...маючы на ўвазе не толькі іх красу, не толькі палепшанне версіфікатарскай снароўкі пры працы над імі, але і жаданнем прышчапіць да беларускай пісьменнасці здабыткі чужаземнага паэтычнага труда, памагчы атрымаць ёй больш еўрапейскі выгляд’<sup>10</sup> (Bagdanovič, 1995, p. 244).

The poet was particularly attentive to sonnet. Together with the above-quoted letter, he sent an article *Saniet* (Sonnet), in which he revealed the essence and analysed the structure of this poetic form – polished and faceted by centuries of poetic construction. But it was not Bahdanovič who began the history of the Belarusian-language sonnet.

The first poem that can be defined as a sonnet published in the Belarusian language was the fourteen line poem *Žnivo* (The Harvest) by Janka Kupala. The poem was placed in the newspaper *Naša Niva* on 15 July 1910 (under the work there was a Postscript – ‘Petersburg, June 1910’). However, there is one more piece of evidence mentioned by Uladzimir Sieńkaviec:

<sup>9</sup> ‘The poet is the nerve, sight and hearing of his time... one who opposes variability and entropy, who gives true form to a piece of a gross life. Maybe that is why the poet’s [M. Bahdanovič’s – S. M.] craving for very strict, crystal-hard forms of poetry was so strong, forms requiring filigree, jewelry processing’.

<sup>10</sup> ‘... having in mind not only their beauty, not only improvements of some versification skill when working over them, but also the desire to instil the achievements of foreign poetic labour in Belarusian writing, to help it become more European’.

Двума гадамі пазней (1912 г.) у Вільні быў выдадзены зборнік вершаў заходнебеларускага паэта Гальяша Леўчыка *Чыжык беларускі*, у якім аўтар змясціў два творы, названыя санетамі. Пад імі пазначаны час і месца напісання вершаў: 27.06.1907, Варшава; 5.09.1907, Слонім. Заўвага аўтара гаворыць пра тое, што яго санеты былі напісаны раней за Купалавыя. Праўда, у друку яны з'явіліся праз пяць гадоў... Аўтар вытрымаў толькі знешнюю, структурна-страфічную, асабліваць санета – чатырнаццаць радкоў складаюцца з двух чатырохрадкоўяў і двух трохрадкоўяў. Усе астатнія паграбаванні жанру аўтар трактуе свабодна<sup>11</sup> (Sen'kavec, 2006, p. 28).

If we turn to what remains unpublished at the present time, thanks to the research of Viachaslaŭ Rahojša, it is known that the first attempt to create a sonnet in the Belarusian language belongs to Aljaksandar Jelski, who made a translation of the sonnet of Adam Mickiewicz *Burza* (The Storm) – the translation was planned for the publication of the *Calendar of the North-Western Region for the 1889* (incidentally, 2019, was the 130<sup>th</sup> anniversary of this translation). Unfortunately, the translation does not meet the requirements of either the syllabic or the syllabo-tonic classical sonnet.

Still, factually, the first publication of a sonnet belongs to Kupala, but it is necessary to note that Janka Kupala, in the same way as Hal'jaš Lieučyk and Aliaksandar Jelski, freely reacted to sonnet requirements – the poem *Žnivo* is written in four-foot amphibrachs – an uncharacteristic metre for a classic sonnet.

The first Belarusian sonnet by Bahdanovič *Pamiž piaskoŭ Jehipieckaj ziamli* (Among the Sands of the Egyptian Land) was published in *Naša Niva* on 1 July 1911. And it was the first Belarusian *classic* sonnet, written according to strict canon rules. Thus, we can distinguish as many as four points of the genesis of Belarusian sonnet.

Freely written ('swung') sonnets, after the publication of *Žnivo*, began to appear in the Belarusian press. They could ignore the requirement of the same number of syllables in a line, for example, in the sonnet by Kupala *Tavaryš moj* (My Friend):

Ці я устану, ці ў пасцелі мёртва сплю –	iambic hexameter
Са мной заўсёды ён, заўсёды гэты жывы слуп.	iambic heptameter

(Kupala, 1997, p. 10).

A caesura was not applied in his 6-foot iambic (J. Kupala, *Zapuščany palac* (The Neglected Palace)):

<sup>11</sup> 'Two years later (1912) in Vilnia was published a collection of poems by the West Belarusian poet Hal'jaš Lieučyk *Čyžyk bielaruski* (The Belarusian Finch), in which the author placed two works called sonnets. Under them there were the time and place of writing the poems: 27.06.1907, Warsaw; 5.09.1907, Slonim. The author's note says that his sonnets were written before Kupala's. However, they appeared in print five years later... The author maintained only external, structural-trophic feature of the sonnet: fourteen lines consisting of two quatrains and two three-lines. The author interprets all other requirements of the genre freely'.

А дома, роскашы // і працы многіх рук,  
Папас магнацкіх перацвіўшых пакаленняў,  
Стаіш, – і цэгла валіцца з гнілых скляпенняў,  
І ў шчыліне гняздо // ўе ўслужлівы павук.  
(Купала, 1996, р. 140).

There is also an amphibrach in the sonnet *Na Kupallie* (On Kupalle) by Lieŭčyk:

Пад голаў злажыўшы дарожны мой клунак,  
На мох пад хваінку я там палажуся  
І ціха за край свой тагды памалюся!...  
(Леўчук, 1912, р. 46).

It is possible to assume that in his article *The Sonnet* Bahdanovič, aimed to regularize the Belarusian sonnet prescription, to introduce fixed-form sonnet canon law into Belarusian literature. Obviously, however, the author did not achieve his aim. Later on, Bahdanovič in *Za try hady. Ahliad bielaruskaj krasnaj piŭmiennasci 1911–1913* (A Review of Belles Lettres 1911–1913) would write about Kupala's sonnets: 'Ёсць колькі санэтаў (праўда ня зусім бездаганых)'<sup>12</sup> (Bahdanovič, 2001). This is a key opinion of Bahdanovič, because, after all, he calls such poems 'sonnets'. Probably, young Maksim was familiar with the famous free sonnets of Charles Baudelaire and other French writers. *Sonnets libertines* (free / liberated sonnets) were not much liked by Baudelaire's contemporaries (such as Theophile Gautier), but later were adopted as interesting sonnet variations. Bahdanovič himself translated into Russian Kupala's sonnet *Žnivo*, preserving the author's 4-syllable foot amphibrach. But in his own texts the Belarusian poet did not allow himself such 'liberties'. As U. Sieńkaviec rightly says:

Традыцыі Купалы ў форме вольнага санета, як і традыцыі Багдановіча – прыхільніка класічнага цвёрдага санета, – будуць працягнуты паэтамі ў 20–30-я гады ХХ стагоддзя, яны знойдуць сваё плённае развіццё ў нашай сучаснай паэзіі, калі творчыя пошукі майстроў слова набылі асаблівую інтэнсіўнасць і маштабнасць<sup>13</sup> (Sen'kavec, 2006, р. 28).

For example, Paŭliuk Trus, Mikhaś Dubroŭski, Alieś Dudar followed Janka Kupała; Uladzimir Žylka, Nataĺlia Arsiennieva, Žmitrok Biadulia, Izrael Plaŭnik – Maksim

<sup>12</sup> 'There are several sonnets (though not quite perfect)'.

<sup>13</sup> 'The traditions of Kupala in the form of a free sonnet, so as the traditions of Bahdanovič – the supporter of a classic fixed-form sonnet – will be continued by the poets in the 20–30s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, they will find its fruitful development in our modern poetry, when the creative searches of the word masters have got a special intensity and scale'.

Bahdanovič. Kupala's and Bahdanovič's ways of writing sonnets go through the history of Belarusian literature of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and move into the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

However, it must be admitted that these two ways in Belarusian sonnet writing arose not only due to the aspirations of Kupala and Bahdanovič, but also for objective reasons. If in the works of the first, the symbolic and unromantic element dominates, where the dominant is the *emotion*, in the other – the neoclassical with the dominant of *rationality*.

Čykvín in conversation with the author of this article at the University of Białystok in 2017, spoke about this division of poetry into *emotion* and *rationality*. The conversation concerned the wreath of sonnets *Śviataja studnia*, which was written by Čykvín almost 50 years ago (the *main sonnet* was created first, marked with the date 06.01.1967, the last one was the fourteenth sonnet – 10.05.1968). Mickiewicz's *Sonety krymskie*, the biography of the great romantic, as well as the Crimean landscapes, which the author of *Śviataja studnia* saw during a visit to the Black sea peninsula served as the inspiration for the wreath. The form of the sonnets in this wreath is free, there may be rhythmic shifts in size, rhymes are sometimes replaced by consonances. This approach is already demonstrated in the first sonnet of the wreath. We give the final tercets:

Дарога ўсё вышэй вышэй пад гору...	iambic pentameter
Назад сысці вярнуцца да пралогу?	iambic pentameter
Дык мацярынства – як гарачка ў хворага!	iambic hexameter

Іду сваёй нятоптанай дарогаю	iambic hexameter
І чую праайчыны ўсюды подых –	iambic pentameter
Бягу на Аю-Даг, гляджу на Чорны воды.	iambic hexameter

(Čykvín, 2009, p. 39).

In this example, assonantal rhyme is used, where only the vowels 'гору – пралогу' rhyme, the consonance 'хворага – дарогаю' is used, and also the truncated rhyme 'подых – воды' – the latter is considered to be 'rich' but inexact. Such rhymes, even truncated, are 'not recommended' for use in a classical sonnet. The same number of syllable feet in lines is not kept. There are so many as if 'disorders' in a small fragment.

Obviously Jan Čykvín modernizes the canon law of the sonnet. The *emotion*, as the author of *Śviataja studnia* admits, and the *rationality*, a priori conditioned in the form of the sonnet, are in contradiction. Therefore, if the most important thing in the work is not to miss and truthfully convey the emotional spectrum of the lyrical hero, a compromise in the way of processing sonnet canon law must be found. Here, for example, the *Mahistrałny saniet*, which, as noted above, was written first, and therefore was the emotional flashpoint, the moment of clarity that generated the whole wreath:

## 15

## Магістральны

Дзе Рым, дзе Крым, а дзе мая айчына –  
 Бягу на Аю-Даг, гляджу на Чорны воды,  
 На гарызонт біноклі дальнабойныя наводжу,  
 Але бацькаўшчыну згэтуль убачыць немагчыма.

І немагчыма тут Міцкевіча затрымаць –  
 Ён думкамі на захад усё адходзіць  
 І мілай Польшчы бярозавы водар  
 Ён чуе, ён бачыць гэту жанчыну.

Па яйлах свабодныя гойсаюць ветры,  
 Ім усё роўна, дзе Крым, дзе айчына,  
 Ці спаць на Рысах, ці спаць на Ай-Петры,

А чалавеку так цяжка спыніцца!  
 Рэжа па сэрцу нудзга безупынна,  
 Косцю у горле стае заграўніца.

(Ўквін, 2009, р. 39).

The rhythm of the verse is so ragged that it seems that we are faced with an attempt to fix impulsive sensations by words that cannot be embedded in evenly rhythmic segments.

line 1 – iambic pentameter.

line 2 – iambic hexameter.

line 3 – iambic heptameter.

In the 4<sup>th</sup> line the iambic strays and it is the word ‘fatherland’ that misleads it. Here in the beginning there is a trochee with an inversion of the accent in the word ‘але’, in fact, the accent in this word disappears, which strengthens the sound of the word ‘fatherland’. In the second half of the line, after the word ‘згэтуль’ and caesura, the narrative iambic returns.

line 5 – the second quatrain also begins with iambic, but the word ‘затрымаць’ misleads it.

line 6 – the poem goes into the tonic verse system. There are 5 accents here.

line 7 – 4 accented tonic verse.

line 8 – 4 accented tonic verse.

line 9 – the beginning of the first tercet – the line ‘is returning’ to the system of syllabo-tonic versification – the probable rhythmic pattern of the flight of free, disobedient winds. Here is a pure 4-foot amphibrach.

line 10 – is also a three-part size, but it is now a more ‘twisted’, waltz-like dactyl

line 11 – again 4 accented tonic verse.

line 12 – the beginning of the second tercet – a return to the three-part size, but now, from the beginning, to a 4-foot dactyl.

line 13 – 4-foot dactyl.

line 14 – 4-foot dactyl.

The entire final tercet is written with a metric foot, consisting of three syllables, and the accent is on the first syllable. Again the waltz-like rhythm... But obviously its tempo is increased. And the final words ‘Косцю у горле стае заграпіца’ through the ‘accelerated’ triple clearly accented metre, are associated with the Mazurka. It is known that the Mazurka is written, like the waltz, in triple meter 3/4 or accelerated 3/8, and the tempo of the Mazurka is faster than in the waltz. Maybe it describes the *Mazurka by Dąbrowski*, the national hymn of modern Poland? At least such a reading of the end of the sonnet is fully possible and has its logical ‘code description’ in the comparison of the rhythm and sense of lines. And not for nothing at the beginning of the sonnet there is ‘Rome’ – the capital of the ‘Italian land’. And the word Poland is pronounced, (and not Lithuania, as in *Sonetny krymskie*, for example), in the first, *Stepy Akermanśkie* (The Akerman Steppes) or in the fourteenth, *Tchatir Dagh* (The Pilgrim). And as the lyrical hero of *Śviataja studnia* suggests: ‘Mickiewicz – has already gone to the West’, the romantic poet will soon also, like the heroes of the Polish anthem, become an emigrant.

When writing a work there is an assumption that the main role is played by the the conscious triad of *emotion*, *rationality* and *intuition* (Barencev, 2018), and at each creative act they are ‘included’ all together, it is impossible to differentiate precisely under which control and how this or that was written, you can only notice where some component of the triad prevailed. For example, in auto-writing or stream of consciousness – *intuition* prevails, in palindromes or other mathematically directed poetic works – *rationality*, in elegiac or lyrical poetry – *emotion*. In classical sonnets – the most complex form of poem – uniformity of all three components is required. Obviously, in the wreath of sonnets *Śviataja studnia*, the author refused to limit strictly the freedom of the flow of emotions and the flow of consciousness, and made a specific adaptation of the external formal structure of the poems to the classical sonnet, thus, in fact, creating an original, modernized, emotionally determined wreath of sonnets.

In general, if we trace the two ways of sonnet writing in the Belarusian literary process, emotionally determined (Kupala’s) and rationally determined (Bahdanovič’s), we can say that the latter in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century gradually began to expand. For example, the wreath of sonnets *Narač* (Lake Narač), written by Nil Hilevič in 1967, almost simultaneously with the wreath *Śviataja studnia* by Jan Čykvin, is in a stricter form, closer to the classical canon. The rhyming of the sonnet is *abab cdcd eef eef* (a compromise with the classical form) is observed in the second quatrain. Pure iambic pentameters are used. But inaccurate rhymes are also used: ‘нанач – Нарач’, ‘нават – навьк’, ‘пра нас – віна’ (masculine truncated). However, after the decanonization of rhymes that took place in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, such rhymes are evaluated as the findings and signs of the author’s style.

The crowns of sonnets *Apakalipsis dušy* (Apocalypse of the Soul) by Žmitrok Marozaŭ can be considered the apogee of the rationally determined way in Belarusian sonnet writing. It was published in 1991 and is considered to be one of the first classical crowns that saw the light of day in an East Slavic language. V. Rahojša characterizes this work as follows:

У *Анакаліпсісе душы* структура кананічнага санета (абаб абаб ссд ддс, пяцістопны ямб) паўсюль вытрымана. Форма вяноў санетаў усюды захавана. Усе вянкi санетаў звязаны – 13 – паміж сабой: апошні вершаваны радок кожнага папярэдняга з’яўляецца пачаткам наступнага; чатырнаццаты вянок санетаў завяршаецца першым радком вянка першага. Вянок *магістральны* даволі арганічна выкрышталізоўваецца з магістралаў усіх чатырнаццаці папярэдніх вяноў санетаў<sup>14</sup> (Rahojša, 2015, pp. 12–13).

But this emotionally determined way in Belarusian sonnet writing at the turn of the millennium narrows, as the creators are interested in taking the challenge of a complex form, and they modernize it according to connected harmonic formulas.

The researcher of *fixed forms* in Belarusian literature Tamara Fiedarcova writes:

У санетыстыцы з’явіліся такія разнастайнасці гэтай вытанчанай формы верша, як „безгаловы” і „бязногі”, „хвастаты” і „перавернуты” і іншыя, нетрадыцыйныя віды санетаў. Ускладнялася архітэктоніка санетных твораў, якія афармляліся ў паэмы, напісаныя санетнымі строфамі, вянкi санетаў і вянкi вяноў санетаў. Пачатак XXI ст. не страціў дасягненні санетыстыкі мінулых гадоў. Але эксперыментальныя пошукі сталі больш рацыянальнымі, прадуманымі<sup>15</sup> (Fedarcova, 2015, p. 159).

The *emotionally determined way* in the Belarusian sonnet writing, is, paradoxically, preserved in the translations of sonnets, especially in the re-creation of Polish syllabic verse. So in the translations of *Sonety krymskie* by Adam Mickiewicz often next to the lines written in iambic hexameters (analogous to the syllabic thirteen-line composition) there are lines with a different number of feet:

<sup>14</sup> ‘In *Apakalipsis dušy*, the structure of the canonical sonnet (abab abab ccd ddc, iambic pentameter) is sustained throughout. The form of the crown of sonnets is everywhere preserved. All the crowns of sonnets are connected – there are 13 crowns of sonnets – among themselves: the last verse line of each previous one is the beginning of the next; the fourteenth crown of sonnets ends with the first line of the first crown. The main crown is quite organically crystallized from the main lines of all fourteen previous sonnet crowns’.

<sup>15</sup> ‘Such varieties of this exquisite form of the poem as “biezhalovy” (headless) and “biaz noh” (legless), “chvastaty” (tailed) and “pieraviernuty” (inverted) and “I” (and) as well as other, unconventional types of sonnets appeared in sonnet writing. The architectonics of sonnets, which were framed in poems written in sonnet stanzas, crowns of sonnets and crowns of sonnet crowns, became more complicated. The beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century has not lost the achievements in sonnet writing of past years. But experimental searches have become more rational, thoughtful’.

...Віхор завьў з трыумфам. Шляхам бурным	5 feet
Па строме, ўскінутай ў напорнай барацьбе,	6 feet
Непераможная йдзе смерць на карабель,	6 feet
Нібы жаўнер, што наступае штурмам...	5 feet

Sonnet IV *Burza*, translated by Jurka Haŭruk (Mickiewicz, 2004, p. 104).

...Сарваны ветразі, руль скрышан, шум завеі,	6 feet
Трывогі галасы, злавесны энк насосаў,	6 feet
Канаты вырваліся з рук матросаў,	5 feet
Заходзіць сонца, з ім апошнія надзеі.	6 feet

Sonnet IV *Burza*, translated by Maksim Tank (Mickiewicz, 2004, p. 104).

„Дзе ж вы, каханне, веліч, слава? Дзе?	5 feet
Вам дадзена бясмерце, плынь – вадзе.	5 feet
О ганьба! Вы прайшлі, крыніца ж вечна б’ецца”.	6 feet

Sonnet VI *Bakczysaraj*, translated by Chviedar Žučka (Mickiewicz, 2004, p. 110).

...Упала забыцця і вечнасці заслона	6 feet
Блішчаць турбаны, быццам бунчукі	5 feet
На войсках прывідаў, і на вякі	5 feet
На плітах заімшэлыя імёны...	5 feet

Sonnet XI *Mogily haremu*, translated by Jazep Siemiažon (Mickevič, 2004, p. 114).

...Ён хлынуў, лінуў, кіпетнем кіпіць...	5 feet
Хаос стыхій, і ў ім, здаецца мне,	5 feet
Душа суцішыцца і думка адпачне.	6 feet

Sonnet X *Bajdary*, translated by Jazep Siemiažon (Mickevič, 2004, p. 115).

There is a question: are these the imperfections of translators, or guidance by Kupala's way? As was mentioned above, in the sonnets of classical Belarusian literature there is also such a 'discord' (*raznaboj*). Therefore, it is possible to assume that translators followed Kupala.

Iryna Bahdanovič approached the translation of *Sonety krymskie* in her own way. Some sonnets in her Belarusian-language restoration may have a three-foot metre:

П і л і г р ы м

Там? Паставіў Алах замак велічны з лёду?	
З мерзлай хмары сабе трон анёлы майструюць?	
Ці там Дзівы мур з чвэрткі сушы будуюць,	
Каб спыніць караван зор – пасланак з усходу?...	

Sonnet V *Widok gór ze stepów Kozłowa* (Mickevič, 2004, p. 76).

Тут, у садзе раскошным, галінкай шыпшыны  
Ты завяла, бо цешыла сэрца часамі,  
Што ў нябыт залатымі даўно матылямі  
Адляцелі, пакінуўшы джала – ўспаміны...  
Sonnet VIII *Grób Potockiego* (Mickevič, 2004, p. 83).

The sonnet *Burza* I. Bahdanovič translates using 5-accent tonic verse:

Ветразі здэ́рты, мачы патрушчаны, лава  
Стогне, шалее, помпаў злавесныя енкі,  
Рэшткі стырна і гужоў, трывожныя зрэнкі,  
Нікне надзея, сонца заходзіць крывава.  
(Mickevič, 2004, p. 75).

Sharp accents, like staccato in music, make the text intermittent, sharp, like the gusts of a storm. It is quite possible to believe that here appears the vision of the translator of the picture that the original creates, and in the transmission of which sound and rhythm writing is used.

Also in the translations of U. Marchiel of *Sonety krymskie* a variety of sizes is used (triple syllabo-tonic and tonic verses). This, as in the versions of I. Bahdanovič, symbolizes different tempos of time and visits to different places in the Crimea.

But in the texts of Mickiewicz's *Sonety krymskie*, all the sonnets are sustained by the syllabic three-part metric foot (dactyl, anapest or amphibrach) with *sredniawka*<sup>16</sup> after the seventh syllable – a very strict size. Obviously, I. Bahdanovič and U. Marchiel approached the translation emotionally, trying to restore the experiences of the lyrical hero in the situation, described in the original, using as one of the means of revealing rhythm.

There are also symptomatic features in the form of translations of Mickiewicz's *Sonety krymskie*. A caesura after the third foot in iambic hexameters was used by U. Żylka, N. Arsieńnieva, A. Chadanovič, I. Kur'jan (a sonnet and *Stepy akerman'skie*). The author of this article in his translation of *Sonety krymskie* kept a feminine caesura after the third foot rather than the analogue of the Polish *sredniawka* after the seventh syllable. However, most translators of *Sonety krymskie* ignored the caesura in this case, as in the sonnets by Janka Kupala, written in iambic hexameters. The caesura is also missed in the latest, the time of writing, translations of *Sonety krymskie*, published by G. Scheiuner in 2010.

Despite the advantages in modern Belarusian sonnet writing of the *rationaly* determined way (Bahdanovič's), the second way – emotionally determined (Kupala's) does not completely disappear, as a large number of sonnets relating to it became clas-

<sup>16</sup> Caesura in the syllabic verses according to the Polish versification system.

sics of the Belarusian literature, forming an approximate basis, which undoubtedly has been taken into account by later writers. However, as Viačaslaŭ Rahojsa noted: ‘Якім шляхам, купалаўскім ці багдановічаўскім, ісці беларускім санетапісцам – гэта іх асабістая справа’<sup>17</sup> (Ragojsa, 2002, p. 199). The problem of unity and harmony of form and content is eternal, and each author demonstrates his own solution, accepting or not accepting, rejecting or modernizing the recommendations / requirements of a certain versification model.

*Translated into English by Marharyta Svirydava*

### List of Sources

- Сыквін, Ян. (2009). *Adno žyccė. Vybranae*. Białystok: PRYMAT. [Чыквін, Ян. (2009). *Адно жыццё. Выбранае*. Białystok: PRYMAT].
- Kupala, Ānka. (1996). *Poŭny zbor tvoraŭ: u 9 t. T. 2*. Minsk: Mastackaā litaratura. [Купала, Янка. (1996). *Поўны збор твораў: у 9 т. Т. 2*. Мінск: Мастацкая літаратура].
- Kupala, Ānka. (1997). *Poŭny zbor tvoraŭ: u 9 t. T. 4*. Minsk: Mastackaā litaratura. [Купала, Янка. (1997). *Поўны збор твораў: у 9 т. Т. 4*. Мінск: Мастацкая літаратура].
- Leŭčyk, Gal’āš. (1912). *Ўжыц беларускі*. Vil’nā: Z’nič. [Леўчык, Гальяш. (1912). *Чыжык беларускі*. Вільня: Зьніч].
- Mickevič, Adam. (2004). *Krymskiā sanety*. Minsk: Medysont. [Міцкевіч, Адам. (2004). *Крымскія санеты*. Мінск: Медысонт].

### References

- Babarėka, Adam. (1927). Z litaraturnyh natatak, *Uzvyyšša*, 1, pp. 134–144. [Бабарэка, Адам. (1927). З літаратурных нататак, *Узвышша*, 1, с. 134–144].
- Bagdanovič, Maksim. (2001). Za try gady. Aglād belaruskaj krasnaj pis’mennasci 1911–1913 g. In: *Poŭny zbor tvoraŭ: u 3 t. T. 2* (pp. 223–229). Minsk: Belarускаā navuka. [Багдановіч, Максім. (2001). За тры гады. Агляд беларускай краснай пісьменнасці 1911–1913 г. В: *Поўны збор твораў: у 3 т. Т. 2* (с. 223–229). Мінск: Беларуская навука].
- Bagdanovič, Maksim. (1995). U rėdakcyū *Maladoj Belarusi*. In: *Poŭny zbor tvoraŭ u 3 t. T. 3* (pp. 244–245). Minsk: Navuka i tėhnikā. [Багдановіч, Максім. (1995). У рэдакцыю „Маладой Беларусі”. В: *Поўны збор твораў у 3 т. Т. 3* (с. 244–245). Мінск: Навука і тэхніка].

<sup>17</sup> ‘Which way to go in writing sonnets, Kupala’s or Bahdanovič’s, is their personal business’.

- Barencev, Rem. (2018). *Ponâtiâ – Obrazy – Simvolŭ*. [Баренцев, Рем. (2018) *Понятия – Образы – Символы*]. Taken from: <http://www.trinitas.ru/rus/doc/0019/d01/00190005.htm> (accessed 25.01.2018).
- Čykvín, Ān. (2005). *Pa pryzvanni i abavâzku. Dva šlâhi razvičcâ belaruskaj paëzi (Maksim Bagdanovič i Ānka Kupala)*. In: Ān Čykvín. *Pa pryzvanni i abavâzku. Litaraturna-krytyčnyâ artykuly* (pp. 9–36). Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku.
- [Чыквін, Ян. (2005). *Два шляхі развіцця беларускай паэзіі (Максім Багдановіч і Янка Купала)*. У: Яг Чыквін. *Па прызванні і абавязку. Літаратурна-крытычныя артыкулы* (с. 9–36). Бiałystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku].
- Fedarcova, Tamara. (2015). ‘Āščë ne moŭknuc’ strojnyâ sanety...’. *Trudy BGTU*, 5 (178), pp. 159–161. [Федарцова, Тамара. (2015). ‘Яшчэ не моўкнуць стройныя санеты...’. *Труды БГТУ*, 5 (178), с. 159–161].
- Ragojša, Vâčaslaŭ. (2015). Pradmova. In: Zmitrok Marozau. *Mne Bogam dadzena Radzima* (p. 3–14). Minsk: Čaturu čvërci. [Рагойша, Вячаслаў. (2015). Прадмова. У: Змітрок Марозаў. *Мне Богам дадзена Радзіма* (с. 3–14). Мінск: Чатыры чвэрці].
- Ragojša, Vâčaslaŭ. (2002). Struktura saneta ŭ Ānki Kupaly âk perakladaznaŭčââ prablema. In: *Matëryaly Mižnarodnaj navukova-tëarëtyčnaj kanferëncyi (Minsk, 3–4 kastryčnika 2002 g.)* (pp. 195–200). Minsk: Belaruskâ navuka. [Рагойша, Вячаслаў. (2002). Структура санета ў Янкі Купалы як перакладазнаўчая праблема. У: *Матэрыялы Міжнароднай навукова-тэарэтычнай канферэнцыі (Мінск, 3–4 кастрычніка 2002 г.)* (с. 195–200). Мінск: Беларуская навука].
- Sen’kavec, Uladzimir. (2006). *Belaruskî sanet. Lâ vytokaŭ žanru*. Brëst: Vydavectva BrDU. [Сенькавец, Уладзімір. (2006). *Беларускі санет. Ля вытокаў жанру*. Брэст: Выдавештва БрДУ].
- Sinila, Galina. (1995). Cvërdyâ ramanskiâ formu ŭ kantëksce liryki Maksima Bagdanoviča. In: Mikola Trus (ed.). *Lës nacýñal’naj kul’tury na pavarotah gistoryi. Zbornik dakladaŭ* (pp. 47–63). Minsk: Litaraturny muzej Maksima Bagdanoviča. [Сініла, Галіна. (1995). Цвëрдыя раманскія формы ў кантэксте лірыкі Максіма Багдановіча. У: Мікола Трус (рэд.). *Лës нацыянальнай культуры на паваротах гісторыі. Зборнік дакладаў* (с. 47–63). Мінск: Літаратурны музей Максіма Багдановіча].
- Stral’coŭ, Mihas’. (1966). *Uryvak z èsë ‘Adkaz na anketu’*. [Стральцоў, Міхась. (1966). *Урывак з эсэ „Адказ на анкету”*]. Taken from: <https://www.facebook.com/MihiasStralcou/posts-mihias-стральцоў-пра-максіма-багдановіча-і-нашаніўцаў-урывак-з-эсэ-адказ-на-анкет/949031975157862/> (accessed: 09.01.2018).
- Vasil’ Dë-Ēm. (2016). *20 nečakanyh faktaŭ pra Īvana Luckeviča*. [Васіль Дë-Ēм. (2016). *20 нечаканых фактаў пра Івана Луцкевіча*]. Taken from: <https://novychas.by/poviaz/20-neczakanyh-faktaŭ-pra-ivana-luckevicza> (accessed: 19.12.2017).

Article submission date: 13 November 2018