A Transformation of Goethe's *Faust*

(Remarks on Pasternak's Translation of *Faust*, with a Survey of the Criticism)

ANGELA LIVINGSTONE

Reading the speeches of Faust in Pasternak's translation,[1] one is struck by how much in them recalls important motifs in Pasternak's own work. When Faust looks at the sign of the macrocosm and exclaims: *"Ia ozhivaiu," "Kakoe istselen'e ot unyn'ia!"* and *"Vse proiasniaetsia, kak na kartine"* (p. 56–57) we think of the motif of waking up, coming alive, rising into clarity, found so often in Pasternak's work. It is found there, for example, in the many resurrectionary moments in *Doktor Zhivago*—and even the nightingale's call of *"ochnis',"* which so impresses Iurii Zhivago, appears, in Pasternak's *Faust*, slightly further on in this same speech. It is also found in many poems, from "Legko prosnut'sia i prozret',"[2] for example, to the sustained vision of the world coming visibly alive through weather-change in the poems of *Kogda razguliaetsia*. This coming alive is frequently compared, in the latter volume, to the effect of art. Thus *"Prosvechivaet zelen' list'ev / Kak zhivopis' v tsvetnom stekle,"* or *"Ruka khudozhnika eshche vsesil'nei / So vsekh veshchei smyvaet griaz' i pyl'"*.[3] This too is foreshadowed in the *Faust* passage quoted: *"kak na kartine."* There is little warrant in the original for Pasternak's rendering of these lines. *"Ich fühle junges, heil'ges Lebensglück / Neuglühend mir durch Nerv' und Adern rinnen"* (l. 432–433)[4] stresses the body and the sanctity of its sensations, as Pasternak never does, and the macrocosmic sign, far from being a cure for despondency, as Pasternak has it, is a calming influence upon Faust's raging inner turbulence. The quoted line starting *"Vse proiasniaetsia"* is wholly invented by Pasternak. By means of it he omits all reference to *"die Kräfte der Natur"* (l. 438) with their suggestion of active organic forces within Faust relating him to something he is at the same time separated from, the organic life outside him. The latter, moreover, is not merely organic but sexual too, since, in addition to nerves, arteries, senses, inner turbulence and mysterious impulse, there is also a considerable suggestiveness in the verbs Goethe uses of "nature"—*"enthüllen"* (l. 438): reveal or disrobe,

and *"liegen"* (l. 441): "she" lies there before him. Pasternak replaces all this with excited aesthetic contemplation of the world's possible divine transfiguration.

Later in the opening scene, translating the song of the Easter choir that saves Faust from suicide, Pasternak gives himself the freedom (perhaps because it is sung) to change *all* the words and simply introduce his own message:

Freude dem Sterblichen,	Преодоление
Den die verderblichen,	Смерти и тления
Schleichenden, erblichen	Славьте, селение,
Mängel umwanden. (l. 738–741)	Пашня и лес. (p. 69)

In such a context, *"pashnia"* recalls the prominence of the same word in the *Kogda razguliaetsia* poems, and of course here is the main *Doktor Zhivago* motif: *"smert' mozhno budet poborot',"* *"smerti net."*

Faust turns to the sign of the Earth Spirit. His highly pasternakian words in response to it: *"Ia rvus' vpered, kak vo khmeliu"* (p. 58), along with the next but one line: *"Gotov za vsekh otdat' ia dushu"* (p. 59) [for Goethe's *"Ich fühle Mut, mich in die Welt zu wagen, / Der Erde Weh, der Erde Glück zu tragen"* (l. 464–465)], call to mind many "rushing onward" or "rushing ahead" passages in Pasternak's work, especially those where the poet leaves, or looks out of, his room and either runs down or shouts to the people outside, wanting to become one of them. An example is the poem "Rassvet"[5] with its lines *"I ia po lestnitse begu"* and *"Ia chuvstvuiu za nikh za vsekh."* Again looking ahead in *Faust*, we find the same sentiment in Pasternak's rendering of the speech Faust makes when, leaving his Gothic study, he walks out amongst the boisterous crowd in the Easter sunshine. Here, as Professor Etkind has shown,[6] he expresses his thought in far more homely and mundane language than he does in Goethe's work, language which serves to unite him with the ordinary people. Moreover, instead of observing how the *"Volk"* enjoys a feeling of validity: *"Zufrieden jauchzet gross und klein: / Hier bin ich Mensch, hier darf ichs sein"* (l. 939–940), Pasternak's Faust adopts that sentiment and statement as his own: *"Kak chelovek ia s nimi ves': / Ia vprave byt' im tol'ko zdes'"* (p. 77). Professor Etkind considers this is a misreading, a mistake, on Pasternak's part. But might it not be part of a deliberate transformation of Faust by Pasternak, part of the reduction of Faust's grandeur, separateness and differentness, of which we find so many signs throughout this translation?

Fundamental in Pasternak's work is a commending of the search for truth and "essence," of straightforward speech and eschewal of rhetorical

theorizing, bombast and self-inflation. This motif is far more salient in the *Faust* translation than in the original. Faust's humbly self-ironic lines:

> Но и себе я знаю цену,
> Не тешусь мыслию надменной,
> Что светоч я людского рода
> И вверен мир моему уходу... (p. 56)

rather reminiscent of Zhivago resisting Liverii's claims—have no straight equivalent in the German. Goethe's Faust utters, rather, the sadness of the scholar who has lost the illusion of possessing real knowledge. Similarly, when Faust, a little later, tells Wagner: *"Und wenn's euch Ernst ist, was zu sagen, / Ist's nötig, Worten nachzujagen?"* (l. 552–553), and Pasternak translates this as *"Kogda vser'ez vladeet chto-to vami, / Ne stanete vy gnat'sia za slovami"* (p. 63). Again one is reminded of Pasternak's own poems, particularly of *"polnoi gibeli vser'ez"* in the poem "O znal by ia, chto tak byvaet..."[7]—which goes on to offer the parallel to the Pasternak-Faust's *"vladeet"*: *"Kogda stroku diktuet chuvstvo, / Ono na stsenu shlet raba."* Devotion to genuine feeling and the truth it contains, to the point of being its unmurmuringly obedient servant, is very much Pasternak's theme, and he does not distinguish "feeling" from "line," as Faust does when he tells Margarete: *"Gefühl ist alles; / Name ist Schall und Rauch"* (l. 3456–3457).

Foreshadowing his own poem "Vo vsem mne khochetsia doiti / Do samoi suti,"[8] Pasternak makes Faust long to understand *"vse sushchee v osnove"* (p. 56) in the opening speech. This is not the same as the more concrete and biological *"Wirkenskraft und Samen"* (l. 384) which Goethe's Faust longs, not to "understand," even, but to "behold." Moreover, Pasternak's Faust does not contrast the truthspeaking he strives for with any previous "word-rummaging" of his own but, tacitly, with the surrounding society and its dishonest verbiage. Because of this he is solitary:

Dass ich erkenne, was die Welt	А понял бы, уединясь,
Im Innersten zusammenhält,	Вселенной внутреннюю связь,
Schau' alle Wirkenskraft und Samen,	Постиг все сущее в основе
Und tu' nicht mehr in Worten Kramen.	И не вдавался в суесловье.
(l. 382–385)	(p. 56)

Pasternak does not reflect in his translation the frequency of the words *"Welt"* (twelve times in Goethe's first 680 lines) and *"Natur"* (six times). He uses *"mir"* only six times and *"priroda"* only twice, otherwise employing *"zhizn',"* *"vse,"* *"vselennaia,"* *"bytie,"* *"tvorenie,"* or just omits the concept. Goethe's *"Welt,"* when not defined, as, for example, *"Geisterwelt"* or *"Mottenwelt"* (which I have not included in the twelve

counted) and when not clearly referring to the social world, appears to have two applications. One is to Faust's "inner" world (*"die Brust, die eine Welt in sich erschuf"* [l. 491]) and the other is to something very close to *"Natur"*: the "outer" world with its *own* inner dimension (*"was die Welt / Im Innersten zusammenhält"* [l. 382–383]). What seems to me of interest here is that while these two uses of the word imply a split between two "worlds"—Faust's soul and the cosmos, basic to Goethe's idea of a human being wrestling and actively seeking union with the surroundings—this is so little any part of Pasternak's Weltanschauung that he systematically confounds the difference between the two "worlds" by dissolving both in a variety of loosely overlapping terms.

Some of these readings of Pasternak's version of *Faust* show a considerable incursion of Pasternak's view of existence: a universe-sized entity, not involving any "inner" dimension, or duality. Many of them, correspondingly, reveal a diminution of Faust's romantic stature. Two further prominent usages that tend to such diminution are: the tone of levity, and the skeptical stance. First, then, where Goethe is earnest, Pasternak is often almost flippant. Thus in the opening scene, addressing the moon, Faust desires *"Um Bergeshöhle mit Geistern schweben, / Auf Wiesen in deinem Dämmer weben"* (l. 394–395), a sentimental yearning which Pasternak thoroughly puts paid to with his mocking substitution of "heights," *"Gde fei s el'fami v tumane / Igraiut v priatki na poliane!"* (p. 56). Later, when he has summoned up the Erdgeist and it scorns his timidity with the words: *"Bist du es, der, von meinem Hauch umwittert, / In allen Lebenstiefen zittert..?"* (l. 496–497), Pasternak drops all noble-sounding reference to "breath" or to "deeps of life" and gives us: *"Ia zdes', i gde tvoi zamashki? / Po telu begaiut murashki"* (p. 60), changing the horror to something tame, colloquially familiar, even childish.

Secondly, Pasternak will often introduce a measure of quiet skepticism by adding such words as "seem" or "so-called." *"Bin ich ein Gott?"* (l. 439) asks Faust, as he looks at the macrocosmos sign, already beginning to live the illusion. This becomes *"I vot mne kazhetsia, chto sam ia—bog"* (p. 58): here Faust watches himself entertaining the "god"-idea, rather like Pasternak watching the young Dudorov playing God in the garden, or like Zhivago assessing the infinite confidence of Strelnikov as he strides into the railway carriage.

There is a striking instance of this skeptical method in the scene after the dialogue with Wagner. Faust laments that he is *not* nearly a god, as he had thought he was. Now, what stands out in the German is: *"Ich Ebenbild der Gottheit"* (l. 614) and *"Ich, mehr als Cherub"* (l. 618)—that

is, a certain exalted indignation that "I who *am* . . ." these things, after all, should be reduced to something less! Not so in Pasternak: *"Ia, nazvannyi podob'em bozhestva,"* and *"Ia schel sebia..."* (p. 65). True, Goethe includes a clear statement of Faust's error in the words, *"sich gedünkt"* (l. 615) and *"vermass"* (l. 621), but Pasternak puts this statement both in a dominant position near the beginning of the list of allusions and then repeatedly throughout it, while in Goethe it comes weakly at the beginning (*"gedünkt"*) and strongly (*"vermass"*) only at the end, almost as an epilogue or reminder that, yes, all that self-exaltation *must* be seen as wrong. Goethe's arrangement leaves him with five clear lines free of the framing notion of hubristic presumption, and in these five lines what is expressed is again the quasi-physical enjoyment of "nature," "power," "heavenly lustre," "life of the gods" and so on. But Pasternak emphasizes the presumptuousness in a whole series of cerebral verbs and verbal nouns: "called," "Presumed myself to be," "obvious blinding," "overvalued," "considered myself," "decided" and "presumption," omitting all trace of *"fliessen"* and *"geniessen,"* all voice of the body. Instead of the splendid hubris of Goethe's *Faust*, in which the power to be as grand as the gods is evoked despite the literal statement, Pasternak conveys mere regret about a wilful error—a sad but unpassionate mental acknowledgement:

Ich Ebenbild der Gottheit, das sich schon
Ganz nah gedünkt dem Spiegel ew'ger Wahrheit,
Sein selbst genoss in Himmelsglanz und Klarheit,
Und abgestreift den Erdensohn;
Ich, mehr als Cherub, dessen freie Kraft
Schon durch die Adern der Natur zu fliessen
Und, schaffend, Götterleben zu geniessen
Sich ahnungsvoll vermass, wie muss ich's büssen!
Ein Donnerwort hat mich hinweggerafft.

(l. 614–622)

Я, названный подобьем божества,
Возмнил себя и вправду богоравным.
Насколько в этом ослепленье явном
Я переоценил свои права!
Я счел себя явленьем неземным,
Пронизывающим, как бог, творенье.
Решил, что я светлей, чем серафим,
Сильней и полновластнее, чем гений.
В возмездие за это дерзновенье
Я уничтожен словом громовым.

(p. 65)

Finally, it is interesting to note how Pasternak translates some of the most well-known lines of Faust's self-characterization. In the scene "Wald und Höhle," Faust defines himself through rhetorical questions:

> Bin ich der Flüchtling nicht? der Unbehauste?
> Der Unmensch ohne Zweck und Ruh',
> Der wie ein Wasserstürz von Fels zu Felsen brauste
> Begierig wütend nach dem Abgrund zu? (l. 3348–3351)

He sees himself as an irresistible force which just cannot help but go on and destroy someone, using images of an oratorical power and beauty that tend to justify his plan, while the interrogative mode charges it all with great emotion. Meanwhile in Pasternak we find Faust is not a "fugitive" but a "wanderer"; is not homeless but a "gloomy degenerate"; not an inhuman or more than human monster, but instead a Pechorin-like type who goes around "sowing grief and dissension." If he is like a waterfall, then not like Goethe's impetuous and dreadful *"Wasserstürz"* crashing uncontrolled from rock to rock, and not going the great distance that is implied by "towards the abyss," but just a "waterfall flying into the chasm" with a single neat swoop. This is by comparison a very big understatement:

> Скиталец, выродок унылый,
> Я сею горе и разлад,
> Как с разрушительною силой
> Летящий в пропасть водопад (p. 190).

Nor is Faust, as he says in the original five lines later, the "hated of God" (*"der Gottverhasste"*), he is merely a "scoundrel" (*"zlodei"*). In Pasternak, Faust cannot get away with anything through romantic exaggeration; he is unambiguously blameworthy.

To examine the detail of Pasternak's translation of *Faust* in this way is to find that he consistently reduces the autonomy and largeness of Faust's feelings and of his mental gestures. As in *Doktor Zhivago*, the general coherence of the world, its indivisibility from human perception and creation, is more important to Pasternak than is any one person's heroism or inwardness. History is large, art is large, "life" is large, while the individual artist or lover is the world's humble contributor and carrier.

The way Pasternak conceives of Faust in his Goethe translation is continuous with the way he treats Faust in some six or seven early poems. In "Margarita,"[9] for example, Margarita is not an object seen by Faust but instead the subject from whose position Faust is seen or

sensed, and he has become entirely environment: bird song, the smell of grass or herbs, rain, a silveriness in the trees—all nature's alluring powers at once and not distinct from them. Likewise, in the other Faust-poems of the early volumes, Faust is evoked only in order to be either diffused amongst intensely felt surroundings or else shown as a disappearing figure. In "Mefistofel',"[10] a poem which is all landscape, weather, activities of crowds, diabolic legs and sunset, we *just* glimpse Faust in the very last line, locked in a subordinate clause and vanishing into Mephisto's pawing embrace and, as it were, right off the edge of the poem: ([Mephistopheles] *"shagal, priiatelia oblapia"*). And in "Elene"[11] Faust is evoked only to be interchanged with Hamlet and then replaced by the sheer infinite behavior of the fields and meadows.

Faust, Part I, was translated into Russian fifteen times (starting in 1853) before Pasternak made his version, and Part II seven times (from 1851). The most widely read translation was that made by N. Kholodkovskii in 1878. Two important poets had translated it—Fet in 1882–1883 and Briusov in 1928 (only his Part I was published in full). If yet another translation was required, this was presumably because the authorities hoped for one that would reflect a Soviet view of the world. When Pasternak's translation of Part I appeared in 1950 it "became clear," according to L. Fleishman,[12] "that a chasm separated the poet from his literary surroundings"—at least, from some of them: the book was reprinted twice in the following four years, then again in 1960 after Pasternak's death, in an edition of 50,000. Olga Freidenberg, his scholarly cousin, when she read the volume he sent her at the end of 1953, wrote to him: "This is the first Russian Goethe," and "You have changed the nature of translating, transformed it from the usual foreigner in a kaftan to an autonomous original which one reads avidly and without any sense of being a guest."[13]

The "chasm" was delineated by one T. Motyleva in a lengthy review published in *Novyi mir* in 1950.[14] Motyleva considered that Pasternak had reprehensibly distorted Goethe's ideas by introducing an "aesthetic-individualist" tinge. She blamed him for omitting or altering lines which suggested an optimistic or anti-religious philosophy and said he had failed to fulfil "the duty of the Soviet translator—carefully to convey all those lines in *Faust* that reveal Goethe-the-thinker, the mocker of official churchdom and its handmaiden the pseudo-science of scholasticism." He had given, she claimed, brilliant renderings of all the mystical parts, where he was like a fish in water, but inadequate ones of the passages

where Goethe expresses, "boldly and soberly," life-affirmative ideas or praise of practicalities. Many of her points are accurate enough—as we have seen, Pasternak does indeed make remarkable omissions—but her parti-pris makes her fail to notice that he is just as inexact in his rendering of the transcendental and supernatural parts as he is in that of the "soberer" sections, that in fact he makes a different poetry of *all* of it. To look for Soviet materialism in Pasternak's translation is as futile as to consider that one has found it in the original.

Similar criticism was expressed in a review by Z. Dymshits in *Literaturnaia gazeta* later that year. The introduction to the 1957 edition of Pasternak's translation, written by N. Vil'mont, contained the following sentence: "Boris Pasternak has made *Faust* into a live manifestation of Russian poetry; the essential has been achieved—a poetic metamorphosis, a new Russian re-writing (or *re-expression* [*perevyrazhenie*]) of *Faust*, remarkable for the force of its verse and style"; but this was cut out from the fourth edition of the translation.

For subsequent commentaries on Pasternak's *Faust* we have to turn to German and émigré writers. The standard study of Russian *Faust*-translations is Wilma Pohl's book *Russische Faust-Übersetzungen* (1962).[15] Under five headings—1) translating method, 2) translator's commentary, 3) changes to the content, 4) versification, 5) speech styles—Pohl examines eight translations of *Faust* Part I, including Pasternak's. The others are by Huber (who, she concludes, sentimentalizes), Vronchenko (who rationalizes), Strugovshchikov (who banalizes), Kholodkovskii (makes no distortions though tends to be lofty), Fet (closely reproduces the metre) and Briusov (even closer reproduction of the metre and great exactitude in rendering meaning).

I will look briefly at some of her findings, which my own have in many instances corroborated. While I have analyzed Pasternak's translation in relation to his own creative work, Pohl provides a full and comprehensive survey. §1. In general, Pasternak simplifies and modifies, as well as adding transitional sections of his own and a number of explanatory passages. (§2. There is little on Pasternak's views, as his relevant correspondence had not yet been made public.) §3. He considerably strengthens the Christian element—as did translators in tsarist times, but while they felt compelled to do so by the reigning censorship, just the opposite pressure worked upon Pasternak, so that this feature of his translation is the more remarkable; the omission of Faust's *"Fluch dem Glauben"* ("curse upon faith" [l. 1605]), noted with indignation by Motyleva, is one example among many; further, he often omits or mod-

erates references to action or activity, including the activity of nature; and he makes frequent use of the word *"len'"* ("laziness") as if *this* were what Faust was fighting in himself. §4. The versification is simplified and much musicality is brought in by repetition of consonants and vowels. §5. The characters, Pohl finds, are not so distinct as in the original—Gretchen becomes more literary, Faust less so; altogether a greater roughness and coarseness of vocabulary, along with a tendency to make things more concrete and visible, and less emotional. "In the translation the world is seen, so to speak, more with the eyes than with the heart"[16]; words such as *"Herz," "Seele"* and *"Gefühl"* are translated into less common and less emotional words (*"Fühl ich mein Herz nach jenem Wahn geneigt"* (l. 4) ["I feel my heart inclined to that illusion"] becomes *"ili ostyl moi molodoi zador"* (p. 37) ["or has my youthful fervor gone cold"]; *"bessre Seele"* (l. 1181) ["better soul"] becomes *"to luchshee, chto dvizhet mnoi"* (p. 86) ["that better thing, that moves me"]). She notes in Faust's speech a more everyday plainness and a loss of the "poetic enchantment"; further, exclamations are often replaced by indicatives, subordinate clauses are rewritten as main clauses, so that the effect of *Steigerung* (mounting up) is lost and a smoother calm is introduced; not only the word *"Gefühl"* ("feeling") but also the word *"Natur"* is often dropped and Faust appears far more an observer of, than a participant in, nature's processes. A similar downgrading and colloquializing of Mephistopheles' speeches turns out to be far more appropriate! In conclusion Pohl accepts Vil'mont's word *"perevyrazhenie"* or *"Nachdichtung,"* and finds the chief features of Pasternak's re-expression in the *"Entpathetisierung,"* and the *"Minderung der Gefühlsbetontheit"* ("lessening of the emphasis on feeling") which she has pointed out. She is very far from condemning the work, however. On the contrary, she says at the opening of her study that it "exerts a force of attraction which is in many places almost equal to that of the original,"[17] and at the end she points to "a new unitary atmosphere of its own" and the spell-binding power of the rhythms: "no other translator has made so readable a version."[18]

Etkind, in the work already referred to, analyses further the way Pasternak makes *Faust* more colloquial and concrete, introducing unwarranted connotations of housework and other everyday settings. Unlike Pohl, Etkind thinks Pasternak has succeeded in conveying the *"mnogogolosie,"* the varying characteristic voices, a view N. Liubimov also puts in his 1966 introduction to a selection of Pasternak's translations,[19] stressing the great variety of rhythms. Etkind concludes, in implicit

contradiction of Motyleva, that Pasternak's purpose was "to read *Faust* with the eyes of a contemporary of our time <...> he achieved his aim <...> but in certain crucial passages <...> he committed some fatal errors."[20]

In 1964 an unpublished East German dissertation on *Faust* in Soviet literature, by F. Leschnitzer,[21] renewed Motyleva's approach and argued that Pasternak, a man of bourgeois background and refinement, theologizes *Faust* in a most reactionary way, unable to do justice to a work whose essence is freedom and depth.

A short, intelligent piece by Dimiter Statkov in 1972[22] takes issue with Pohl, asserting that the most important change Pasternak makes is the introduction of a strong shift towards poetry (in the original the marked contrast between verse and prose generates a multiplicity of forms) and that *through* his greater lyricism, musicality and "atmosphere," Pasternak often gets very close to the original despite differences in the literal meanings—he somehow gives the meaning through the music. Similarly Etkind had written that the same "spiritual world" is conveyed in, for example, Gretchen at the spinning-wheel, despite wholly different vocabulary.

Lev Kopelev offers in 1979 a rapid survey of the influence of *Faust* in Russian literature and quotes Goethe's remark that "the Scot tries to penetrate into *Faust*, the Frenchman to understand it, and the Russian to make it his own property"—all the Russian translations, claims Kopelev, have done this. He quotes Pasternak's most telling remarks on *Faust*, then compares first and final versions of certain passages of his translation. While the latter versions are occasionally more exact, he finds, their trend is to become more simple and harmonious. Altogether, Pasternak is more literary than Goethe, and dislikes the devil more than Goethe does—but he resembles Goethe in that "in the final analysis he too is both fruitfully contradictory and splendidly inconsequential."[23]

Views that centrally emerge from these various studies are that Pasternak makes *Faust* more literary, poetic and harmonious, and more religious, as well as making it more plain, colloquial and vulgar; also that he diverges excessively from the original text and simultaneously creates a new work that *corresponds* in some vital way to the original. Pohl, for instance, makes both the latter judgements, and Etkind adds to his adverse criticism the view that Pasternak makes the poetic power of *Faust* available as never before. Of course, the question is begged as to whether the power in a translation or imitation is the *same* power as that in the original. Pasternak, himself, writing on translation a few

years before undertaking work on *Faust*, does not actually ask the question but does give a sort of answer to it:

> Correspondence of text to text is too weak a link <...>. To attain its purpose a translation has got to be linked with its original by a more actual dependence. The relation between an original and a translation must be that between a base and its derivative, between a tree-trunk and a cutting from it.[24]

Pasternak felt he was successful in conveying Goethe's "power," not only because he caught it like a contagious energy from the text, but apparently for two other reasons. One is that his work had been prepared, he felt, by all that preceded it in Russian literature, especially by the work of Lermontov, Tiutchev and Blok, in whom "much of what was most powerful derived precisely from here" (i.e. from *Faust*). He was surprised "how this continuity was able to bypass Briusov and Fet. *Faust* in Russian can succeed *involuntarily, impulsively.*"[25] The second reason is that he had done the work at a time that was painful and strange for him because personally so very difficult—"amongst hindrances and obstacles, with absent head, in a constant exchange of tragedies with the most carefree exultation, and nothing mattered a fig to me and it seemed as if I could do anything."[26]

NOTES

1. Iogann Vol'fgang Gete. *Faust*. Perevod B. Pasternaka. M., 1960. The work was first published in its entirety in 1953. All quotations in the present article are from the 1960 edition.
2. B. Pasternak. *Izbrannoe v dvukh tomakh.* M., 1985, vol. 1, p. 318.
3. Ibid., pp. 431, 460.
4. All quotations from *Faust* are taken from *Goethes Faust.* Herausgegeben und erläutert von Erich Trunz. Dritte Auflage. Hamburg, 1954.
5. B. Pasternak. *Izbrannoe . . .*, vol. 1, p. 413.
6. E. Etkind. "Otkrytie stilia." *Poeziia i perevod.* M., 1963.
7. B. Pasternak. *Izbrannoe . . .*, vol. 1, p. 329.
8. Ibid., p. 422.
9. Ibid., p. 118.
10. Ibid., p. 119.
11. Ibid., p. 106.
12. L. Fleishman. *Boris Pasternak: The Poet and His Politics.* Cambridge, Mass., 1990, p. 257.
13. B. Pasternak. *Perepiska s Ol'goi Freidenberg*. E. Mossman, ed. New York, 1981, p. 308.
14. T. Motyleva. "*Faust* v perevode B. Pasternaka." *Novyi mir*. No. 8 (1950), pp. 239–243.
15. Wilma Pohl. *Russische Faust-Übersetzungen*. Meisenheim am Glan, 1962.

16. Ibid., p. 141.
17. Ibid., p. 129.
18. Ibid., p. 167.
19. N. Liubimov. "Predislovie." *Zvezdnoe nebo. Stikhi zarubezhnykh poetov v perevode Borisa Pasternaka*. E. Levitin, sost. M., 1966, p. 21.
20. E. Etkind, op. cit., p. 214.
21. Franz Leschnitzer. *Goethes 'Faust' und die sowjetische Literatur*. Doctoral thesis. Rostock University, 1964.
22. Dimiter Statkov. "Pasternak's *Faust*-Übersetzung und der Gegensatz von Poesie und Prosa im Original." *Arcadia*. No. 7/1 (1972).
23. Lev Kopelev. "Faustovskii mir Borisa Pasternaka." *Boris Pasternak 1890–1960. Colloque de Cerisy-la-Salle*. Paris, 1979, p. 510.
24. Quoted from: A. Livingstone, ed. *Pasternak on Art and Creativity*. Cambridge, 1985, p. 186.
25. B. Pasternak. *Perepiska . . .* , p. 272.
26. Ibid., pp. 279–280.