

MENTALITY OF A SOVIET MAN IN THE MASTER AND MARGARITA AFTER M. BULGAKOV: ENGLISH AND GERMAN TRANSLATION REFLECTION

Alexandra Milostivaya
Tatiana Marchenko

Abstract

This paper aims to analyse the passages that convey semiotic culture codes from The Master and Margarita after M. Bulgakov and its translations into English and German. The paper challenges to reveal correlation between reasonable rendering and elimination of codes on the one hand and peculiar features of national mentalities of the source language and the target language speakers on the other hand. The study shows that the author of the Source Text and the translators of English and German Target Texts view semiotic culture codes as being equivalent but not fully identical.

Key words: semiotic culture code, culturonym, translation reflection.

Introduction

Semiotic and cultural aspects of studying the text of literary translation are in the focus of current research in translatology. In particular, cultural translation is mentioned more and more often and according to Sturge it “refers to those practices of literary translation that mediate cultural difference, or try to convey extensive cultural background, or set out to represent another culture via translation” (2009: 67). The trend seems logical and consistent as a literary work presents the culture of the source language (SL) and along with factual explicit information conveys implicit semiotic codes of the SL. Yifeng claims it is common knowledge that translation “reduces the foreign, the reading of translated texts is deprived of the opportunity of experiencing something different” (2006: 28). The mission of a translator is to decipher the codes so that the Target Text (TT) could be transparent to the representative of a different linguoculture.

This way of understanding the cultural mission of a translator of literary works casts a new light on the idea that the cornerstone of translation could be the tool approach to the Source Text (ST). Its model was introduced by Dridze (1980: 56). According to this approach the question “Why and what for is something said in the text?” comes prior to conventional questions “What is touched upon in the text?”, “What is said?” and “How is it put into words?”. Only the reference to this type of interpretative tools provides communicatively adequate decoding of the fictional world created by the author that bears great resemblance and at the same time no resemblance to the real world; it is the world that conveys the author’s outlook encoded in images.

As a rule, a literary work is made of many layers: besides superficial plot-and-fact narration there are additional semantic prospects derived from the general content. Following the tradition of Tartu-Moscow school of literary narration analysis, we will denote these prospects as semiotic culture codes (SCCs). Lotman (2000: 554), one of the leading followers

of the school, emphasized the importance of the semiotic code in cross-cultural communication:

Коммуникация между неидентичными отправителем и получателем информации означает, что “личности” участников коммуникативного акта могут быть истолкованы как наборы неадекватных, но обладающих определенными чертами общности кодов. Область пересечения кодов обеспечивает некоторый необходимый уровень низшего понимания. Сфера непересечения вызывает потребность установления эквивалентностей между различными элементами и создает базу для перевода. (Communication between non-identical addresser and addressee means that the “personalities” of the participants can be treated as sets of inadequate codes which have some corresponding features. The field of intersection of these codes provides some essential level of initial understanding. The area of non-intersection preconditions the necessity to determine equivalence between different elements and provides the basis for translation).

A few words of comment are necessary here. The “area of non-intersection” of codes in the quoted passage refers to cultural differences between the SL speakers and the TL speakers. Thus, it seems reasonable to assume that culture codes permeate any text, literary texts as well. We will refer to “culture code” as a “web” spread by culture all over the surrounding world, it also divides it in parts, categorizes and supplies it with assessment. It is noteworthy that a well-known Russian translologist Komissarov states that it is essential to translate not only the ST but a text plus context (2001: 62), so Venuti views translation as a “labour of acculturation” as well (1992: 5).

In the light of this wide range of translator’s activity it seems obvious that literary translation deals with ideas, not language signs. Consequently a translator gets to the meaning through analysis of verbal means and interpretation of the semiotic code within the translated passage.

The analysis of rendering the “underlying” meaning of the ST suggests that a translator decodes a SCC individually, following his own unique perception. Garbovskiy (2004: 319) views this aspect of literary translation activity as follows:

Переводчик пытается воссоздать виртуальный образ действительности: он не перерисовывает вновь, как копиист, фрагмент реальной действительности, описанный автором оригинала, он должен выразить иными средствами то, что уже выражено в оригинальном тексте. В результате такого воссоздания рождается еще одна картина, в которой реальность просматривается сквозь призму двойной субъективности мировосприятия, субъективности автора и переводчика. (A translator takes up a challenge to reconstruct a virtual image of reality: he does not act as a copyist redrawing some piece of reality represented by the author of the source. He is to express in other means what is already expressed in the ST. Such reconstruction results in the development of one more image in which reality is viewed in the light of double subjectivity of mentality, subjectivity of the author and the translator.)

This mechanism of interaction between a literary work and the translator proves that the author and the translator employ different SCCs which intersect but are not identical by nature. Consequently, there is no objective translation of a literary work. At best one can manage to successfully decode the differences between SCCs of SL native speakers and the ones of target language (TL). Hence Garbovskiy and Kostikova claim that “translational expression of

foreign culture phenomena with TL signs is impossible without comparison between “ethnically foreign” and “ethnically own” (2012: 58).

In the present study we set out to analyze a number of excerpts from the novel *The Master and Margarita* after M. Bulgakov and its translated versions in English and in German¹. The excerpts under consideration demonstrate both felicitous and poor instances of rendering SCCs. Our analysis involves observations of both excerpts containing culturonyms in which a translator is mainly focused on the source culture and the passages translated with the adaptation to the target culture.

Translation as a means to reflectively interpret mentalities of representatives of different nations

National mentality is a generally accepted notion in the Humanities. According to Prohorov and Sternin it denotes «национальный способ восприятия и понимания действительности, определяемый совокупностью когнитивных стереотипов нации» (‘a national way of comprehension and understanding reality which is determined by a set of national cognitive stereotypes’) (2007: 92). The reference to the term implies that every nation has a unique invariant vision of objective reality. This fact results in differences related to symbolic meaning of one and the same semiotic code in different cultures. This meaning could be incomprehensible and it often provokes conflicts with native speakers in a foreign environment. As regards translation the difference in mentalities of a SL speaker and a TL speaker can result in mismatch of SCCs in a ST invariant and TT variants, i.e. the TT will not convey the meaning implied by the author.

It seems highly probable that national culture mentalities and their language representants are most evident in ambivalent historical epochs. It is exactly the case with the socialist period. From this perspective *The Master and Margarita* after M. Bulgakov can fully meet this criterion. The novel presents a specific “mirror” reflecting socio-political and economic life of Soviet people in the 1920s-1930s.

Originally M. Bulgakov’s most relevant book was entitled “Black Magician” or “Engineer’s Hoof”. The writer started his work in winter 1929-30. he dictated to his wife final passages and remarks in February, 1940, three weeks prior to his death.. The work on the novel lasted almost ten years. The book is polyphonic, abundant in complex philosophic and moral problems, it covers a wide range of topics. The novel creates the atmosphere of fear and political persecutions of the 1930s experienced by the author himself. Most vividly the oppression, persecution of an extraordinary talented personality by the Soviet state are depicted by Master’s example. Not without reason this character can be considered autobiographic in many aspects.

The plot of the novel is fictitious. The Devil accompanied by his retinue unexpectedly visits the fervently atheistic Moscow. They wreak unprecedented havoc. The Devil administers justice and metes out punishment with superficial might. Still it should be admitted that only rotten or decayed things come under his evil spell. Moreover the reader can see that the author is quite ironic about the Devil. In any case it serves a perfect opportunity for M. Bulgakov to bring to justice literary rogues, bureaucrats and the whole inhuman bureaucratic system. Witty political satire hidden from censorship hits and exposes social evil.

Thanks to Bulgakov’s talent to notice some minor details of the surrounding world and depict them in his novels a notion “Bulgakov’s Moscow” came into being. The depiction of

these details in English and German translations of the novel is in the focus of our further analysis from the linguo-cultural point of view.

It is claimed to be axiomatic that the culture of any nation finds its reflection in the language. Since any culture is unique, within translation studies the words that express it are treated as unique as well. The translation process is not a mechanical rendering of SL meanings into TL meanings. It is intended to preserve the peculiarities of culture expressed in the language. Many words convey connotative meanings which are not registered in dictionary entries; however, they evoke particular feelings and emotions in native speakers. They denote some specific features of culture, everyday life and thinking. Rendering these words into another language can pose some difficulties. Such words are called *culturonyms*. Following Kabakchi, we will refer to a “*culturonym*” to denote «всех (значимых для данного народа) элементов земной цивилизации» (‘all (relevant for a particular nation) elements of terrestrial civilization’) (2001: 418-419). These are precisely *culturonyms* that serve as material objects representing SCC in a literary text².

Semiotic representations of *culturonyms* can be subjected to compression in the process of translation, namely, the semantic compression through the reduction of *semes* within a unit of translation as compared to the source. In most cases a comparative linguoculturological analysis of a ST and a TT fails to verify the reason for semantic compression of *culturonyms* in this or that case. Given this, it seems irrelevant for our study. The fact that a *culturonym* is an object of reflection on the part of a translator appears to be far more essential. It means that he focuses on the analysis of differential features that are referred to in a translational act between languages and cultures. Thus, we view translation as a way of reflective study of mentalities typical of different nations and their representatives. What one considers to be an obstacle to proper decoding of SCCs could serve as an efficient source for comparative analysis of Soviet people mentality and the mentalities of nations whose languages were target ones as regards to M. Bulgakov’s novel. The analysis involves observations of certain passages from the novel in which the translational communication is challenging.

This brings us to the conclusion that a TT can be regarded as a tool for contrastive study of mentalities of different nations. Now we shall examine the SCCs that most vividly illustrate the peculiar features regarding the mentality typical of Soviet people represented by M. Bulgakov. We shall also scrutinize the way they were decoded by English³ and German translators.

Methodology of mentality analysis based on the data of translation reflection

The study is based on the assumption that translation activity is reflective by nature. As this viewpoint on the study of translation is not generally accepted, it will be useful to outline a number of theoretical propositions and conceptions that constitute the conceptual base of the study.

To begin with, we may consider the notion “reflection” that originates from Latin ‘*reflexio*’ (‘to bend’, ‘to turn backward’, ‘to reflect’). In Russian philosophical tradition reflection is viewed first of all as a correlation between experience and background knowledge of the subject performing some activity (in this case it is translation activity) and the situation described in the passage under interpretation and presented as an object of learning. In Shchedrovitsky’s words, reflection arises in case communicants that are connected by some shared for each of them text (i.e. the author of a literary work and the translator of this work) «должны понимать его по-разному, должны восстанавливать в нем разный смысл

соответственно различию своих позиций и определяемых этим ситуаций» ('are supposed to understand it in different ways, are supposed to derive different meaning that is preconditioned by differences in their positions⁴ and, as a result, situations') (2005: 114).

As Shchedrovitsky states the described extrapolation of reflection to the translation process finds its completion in «приведении смыслов к единому объектному полю» ('reduction integration of meanings into a unified object field') (2005: 115), i.e. in decoding a SCC of the ST carried out by a translator more or less effectively. Thus we can assume that the TT is a metatext in relation to the ST. It presents the product of reflective translation activity. Reflective construction of such metatext, as viewed by Shchedrovitsky, entails cases in which "initial structures of meaning and initial constructions of content turn out to be useless and "отмирают" ('fade away') (2006: 220). We can make a supposition that text representants of such elimination of content-factual and content-conceptual information result from differences in mentalities of participants in translation communication – the author of a literary work and the translator of this work. Such cases apparently result from semiotic differentiation of culture codes in the SL and the TL. Thus, it can be verified through metametasemiotic reflection that is feasible in case a native speaker of the SL makes a study of a literary work in the TL. Given the mentioned conditions of reflection over the secondary metatext on the part of a researcher in the field of translatology⁵ one can carry out the analysis of equivalence in conveying content-factual and / or content-conceptual meaning in case of their dissonance. We assume that the observed "mismatch" between particular aspects of information conveyed in the ST and the TT serves as a marker of differential mental features typical of SL and TL speakers.

In the present article we proceed from two principles that provide objective and coherent description of mentality on the basis of translation reflection.

- **Contrastivity principle** that postulates contrastive study of SCCs in a SL and a TL as a base for reconstruction of mentality.
- **Systemacy principle** that suggests a clearly structured description of all relevant features characteristic of national mentality and eliminates any possibility to bring it to intercultural lacunas only, i.e. as Prohorov and Sternin state «описывать "отсутствующее" невозможно без описания "положительного" материала» ('it is impossible to study the "missing" element without the corresponding "positive" counterpart') (2007: 56-57). As regards the linguoculturological study of a TT of a literary work the "positive" part is supposed to be presented by SCCs marking similarities of mentalities typical of SL and TL speakers. We identify these codes in case there is equivalent translation of culturonyms in the SL and one of the TLs and at the same time it misses in another pair of languages compared⁶.

The goals set in the article entail the employment of a whole set of methods and procedures. The study presupposes several consecutive research stages:

Step 1. Metametasemiotic interpretation of the TT by the researcher and identification of microcontexts that display reflective "challenge" and can results from dissonance between content-factual and / or content-conceptual meaning in the TT and the source culture. At the same time we rely on presumption of referential identity that presupposes rational interpretation of model situations in a literary work. These situations refer to the symbolic world of art and are not actual by nature but capable of conveying actual meaning of real life circumstances and relations.

Step 2. Semiotic categorization of the identified contexts through labeling them as the ones referred to either of the culture codes: "Material items of everyday life" or "Interpersonal communication".

Step 3. Extrapolation of conceptual meaning of the identified SCCs into the sphere of attributes typical of a Soviet man mentality as it is seen by English and German translators.

Step 4. Reference to English and German explanatory dictionaries that codify customary language usage at the period when Bulgakov's novel was translated. Taking into account that English and German cultures are not native for the researcher the reference is meant to verify whether the choice of this or that interpretation of SCCs by the researcher is appropriate or not.

Step 5. Verification of conclusions concerning the adequacy of creating the image of Soviet man mentality in Bulgakov's novel *The Master and Margarita* by English and German translators. It entails the reference to:

- Explanatory dictionaries of Russian literary language that contain linguocultural notes indicating peculiar features of a lexical nominant of a culturonym in a sociocultural customary usage typical of the epoch described by M. Bulgakov;
- Media sources dated to the time presented in the novel and later epochs that retain relicts of Soviet times;
- verifying quotations from other passages of *The Master and Margarita* after M. Bulgakov and other literary works of the author;
- literary works of other authors contemporary with M. Bulgakov and documentary books by later authors;
- informants-representatives of Soviet communication culture of the period in question;
- US-published versions of the novel translated by former Soviet Union expatriates or in co-authorship with them⁷;
- travel notes of foreign writers that contain linguocultural parameters of early Soviet period depicted in the novel in point⁸.

Thus, the method we apply can be characterized as a combination of metametasemiotic interpretation of the TT followed up by categorizing the selected culturonyms according to "Material items of everyday life" and "Interpersonal communication" codes (at the stage of collecting information), hermeneutical analysis of conceptual meaning with specified SCCs that are identified with Soviet mentality attributes in its interpretation by English and German translators (at the stage of processing the data), interpreting dictionary entries and linguocultural materials related to the epoch depicted by M. Bulgakov (at the stage of verifying the data).

Semiotic code "Material Items of Everyday Life" and its presentation in English and German versions of The Master and Margarita

The differences in national mentalities of Europeans and Soviet people described in Bulgakov's novel in many cases have something to do with decoding "Material items of everyday life" culture code including its subcodes "Meals", "Clothes", "House". Let us consider several passages in order to prove the relevance of the assumption.

Here you can see a passage from *The Master and Margarita* that presents the dishes served in the Literary Club "Griboyedov":

- (1) *ST*: 'Где-то в рупоре ГОЛОС командовал: **«Карский раз! Зубрик два! Фляки господарские!!!»** (Булгаков 1988, 63)

TT (a) – Somewhere through a megaphon a voice commanded: “**Karsky kebab, one! Venison, two! Imperial chitterlings!**” (60)

TT (b) – Somewhere a man bellowed through a megaphon: ‘**Chops once! Kebab twice! Chicken a la King!**’ (75)

TT (c) – Irgendwo im Schallrichter kommandierte eine Stimme: “**Karskij eins! Subrik zwei! Herrschaftliche Flak!!**” (64)

TT (d) – Irgendwo kommandierte eine Stimme durchs Sprachrohr: “**Ein karisches! Zwei Hammelbraten Subrik! Fleck nach Herrscherart!**” (78)

It should be noted that the dishes mentioned by M. Bulgakov are quite rare and uncommon. Even a Russian native speaker will have to consult some cookery book to get the idea what the dishes are. Particularly, *Karsky* is a kind of shashlyk, *Imperial chitterlings* is a dish with tripes, and *Zubrik* is either spicy barbecued venison or wild ox’s meat or julienne with this kind of meat. So the English names for the dishes given in the TTs (chops, (Karsky) kebab, venison, chicken a la King) have little to do with what is given in the ST. Most likely the translators employed pragmatic adaption and left out the names of the dishes that do not indicate anything relevant for English native speakers. They substituted them for the names of dishes that are alike but only partially retain the seme “Delicacy of dishes”⁹.

German translators are more precise in rendering denotative information: they refer to meat *a-la karsky*, fried mutton and tripes *a-la masters (nach Herrscherart)*. As we can see only the name of the latter dish is rendered in a communicatively adequate way. But the information about the second dish, the one that is most peculiar and delicate, is about to be overlooked by a German-speaking recipient of the TT.

Thus, English and German versions of the passage (especially the English one) fail to fully and precisely realize the semiotic function of a banquet with such delicate dishes. Still it is the seme “Delicacy of dishes” that is most relevant in the scene. Giving such detailed account of meals enjoyed by Moscow literary men M. Bulgakov makes it clear that such luxury is vicious and looks like a bribe on the part of authorities; this is how they are bought off if they care not to depict the surrounding reality in a critical way. All TTs fail to render allusive context that makes parallels between thirty pieces of silver in the Bible and the luxury in the restaurant dissonant to the poverty of the then average Soviet people¹⁰.

The strong drinks taken by the characters of the novel, their quantity and quality is a relevant semiotic culture subcode that reveals the mentality of a Soviet man. The following example may illustrate the explicit semiotic marking of the alcoholic beverage:

(2) *ST*: Однако! Я чувствую, что **после водки вы пили портвейн!** Помилуйте, да разве это можно делать! (81)

TT (a) – “Well, really! I sense you were **drinking port after the vodka!** For pity’s sake, how can you possibly do that!” (79)

TT (b) – ‘Well, really! I suspect you **drank port on top of vodka** last night. What a way to behave!’ (96)

TT (c) – “So was! Ich habe das Gefühl, dass Sie **nach dem Wodka noch Portwein getrunken haben.** Ich bitte Sie, wie kann man das nur machen!” (85)

TT (d) – “Aber, aber! Ich ahne, daß Sie **gestern nach dem Wodka Portwein getrunken haben.** Ich bitte Sie, wie kann man so etwas machen!”(101)

Within the framework of Soviet culture the fact of drinking port after vodka is the evidence of alcohol addiction. N. Garbovskiy offers that the considered sociocultural phenomenon originates from «неумеренное (количественная категория) употребление дешевых, т.е. доступных (качественная категория), алкогольных напитков» ('excessive (quantitative category) use of cheap, i.e. moderate (qualitative category) alcoholic drinks') (2004: 531). According to the researcher, the passage quoted above states the rule that is clear and transparent to a Russian native speaker and a representative of the Russian culture. The rule says that vodka, the main alcoholic drink in the Russian culture of the Soviet period, should not be followed by any other alcoholic drinks. The character of the novel breaks the rule. It concerns both quantitative and qualitative aspects. As for the amount of the beverages the most striking thing is that the character *drank* the port, not simply *have drunk*. The verb in imperfective aspect – “drank” – denotes a big amount of alcohol as some moderate amount is usually expressed as “have drunk”. In English and German versions of the novel this sociocultural aspect of verbal semantics is not expressed. In our opinion, it leads a reader to misunderstanding as regards the amount of the port taken by the character.

In a qualitative aspect the seme “Alcohol addiction” is implied in the given passage through a special status of the port among the alcoholic drinks in the Soviet period. N. Garbovskiy gives the following account of port and its drinking in the USSR as compared to other countries:

Употребление водки связано обычно с употреблением пищи (с закуской). Момент насыщения пищей может наступить раньше момента насыщения алкоголем, и тогда наступает очередь более легкого и сладкого напитка – портвейна, который можно пить без закуски. Но русский портвейн – это зачастую дешевое крепленое вино сомнительного качества, напиток людей тяжелого материального положения... ('Drinking vodka is usually associated with meals (snacks). The state of satiety can come faster than the state of being sated with alcohol. Then a lighter and a sweeter drink is in turn – the port. It can be taken without any snack. But Russian port is often a low-quality cheap fortified wine, the drink for people who have economic plight...') (2004: 532).

The idea that M. Bulgakov treats port in the light of the above mentioned qualitative connotation is supported by the scene presented in his feuilleton *Cup of life*. People from lower strata of population treat themselves to the beverage in question: «Портвейн московский знаете? Человек от него не пьянеет, а так – лишается всякого понятия» (1989: 402)¹¹.

However, beyond the borders of Russia both vodka and port are relatively expensive beverages taken in moderate amount. Thus, the information concerning the idea of alcohol addiction as a widely-spread social phenomenon in the Soviet times turns to be overlooked by the readers of English and German versions of the novel. The fact is due to confusion of connotations conveyed by the lexeme “port” in the SL and the target one as nothing special is emphasized in drinking port after vodka.

The relevance of semiotic subcode “Clothes” in identifying the social status of a communicant is significantly noted in modern philology works by Belobrovceva and Kul'jus: «В послереволюционной России одежда имела знаковый характер и идеологический смысл, определяла место человека в общественной иерархии, кодируя принадлежность к какой-либо социальной группе.» ('In post revolutionary Russia clothes had a symbolic character and ideological meaning, indicated the social position of a man encoding that he belongs to some social group.') (2007: 145).

So, the symbolic character of head-dress is essentially emphasized in the text of the novel in question. Particularly, I. Belobrovceva and S. Kul'jus claim that such head-dress as a cap is socially marked as it is an essential attribute of proletarians that follow the style of the “main” cap in the country – Mr. Lenin’s cap (2007: 145). Even popular hit songs of the then epoch underline anti-bourgeois character of the cap, e.g. Ya. Feldman’s song “A Grey Hat And a Red Head Scarf”. Here we can refer to a passage in which this semiotic culture subcode is actualized:

- (3) *ST*: Очень, очень приятно, – пискливым голосом отозвался котообразный толстяк и вдруг, развернувшись, ударил Варенуху по уху так, что **кепка** слетела с головы администратора... (113)
TT (a) – “Very, very pleased to meet you,” responded the fat, cat-like man in a squeaky voice, and suddenly, swinging around, he clapped Varenuhka on the ear so hard that **the cap** flew off the manager’s head... (112)
TT (b) – ‘Delighted to meet you,’ answered the stout, cat-like personage. Suddenly it swung round and gave Varenuhka such a box on the ear that his **cap** flew off... (133)
TT (c) – “Sehr, sehr angenehm”, antwortete der katerähnliche Dickwanst mit piepsender Stimme und gab dem Administrator plötzlich im Umdrehen dermaßen eins auf das Ohr, dass **das Käppi** vom dessen Kopf herabflog... (122)
TT (d) – “Sehr, sehr angenehm”, antwortete der katerartige Dickwanst piepsend, holte plötzlich aus und versetzte Warenuhka eine Ohrfeige, daß diesem **die Mütze** vom Kopf flog... (141)

In the German version by T. Reschke the meaning of the Russian lexeme “кепка” (a cap) is rendered by a generalized German equivalent with wider semantics – “Mütze” – that has several dictionary equivalents: “a cap”, “a peaked cap”, “a service cap” and “a field cap”. These types of head-dress differ in shape and size; they are worn by representatives of different social groups. The equivalent “Mütze” is considerably generalized. Hence the TT does not represent the sociosemiotic code of head-dress “a cap” though it is conveyed in the ST. The equivalent chosen by E. Boerner – “Käppi” – most probably denotes uniform head-dress that looks more like a field cap¹². The notion does not convey any semiotic reference to lower strata of society in German linguoculture. English translators are more precise in rendering the semiotic subcode of the head-dress in question. It is preconditioned by the fact that in English culture ‘a cap’ is associated with a traditional head-dress of a worker¹³.

The passage below, on the contrary, contains a reference to a different type of head-dress that used to be a symbol of intelligentsia, representatives of soviet intellectuals:

- (4) *ST*: Первый из них, одетый в летнюю серенькую пару, был маленького роста, упитан, лыс, свою **приличную шляпу пирожком** нес в руке. (11)
TT (a) – The first of them – some forty years old and dressed in a grey summer suit – was short, fed and bald, he carried his **respectable pork-pie hat** in his hand. (5)
TT (b) – The first of them – aged about forty, dressed in a greyish summer suit – was short, dark-haired, well-fed and bald. He carried his **decorous pork-pie hat** by the brim. (13)
TT (c) – Der erste von ihnen war mit einem sommerlich grauen Zweiteiler bekleidet, war von kleinem Wuchs, wohlgenährt, kahl, seinen **dazu passenden Hut** trug er **wie eine Pirogge in der Hand**. (5)

TT (d) – Der eine, etwa vierzig Jahre alt, trug einen mausgrauen Sommeranzug, war von kleinem Wuchs, dunkelhaarig, wohlgenährt und hatte eine Glatze; seinen **gediegenen Hut, der wie ein Brötchen aussah**, hielt er in der Hand. (11)

So M. Bulgakov says about a “respectable” hat. Since Bolsheviks came to power in the USSR nearly nobody wore hats. In the 1930s the hats turned up again and were mostly favored by directors of different Soviet institutions. Thus, such head-dress as a pork-pie hat is undoubtedly semiotically marked. At the period in question it denoted that one was a representative of intelligentsia or new intellectual elite. That is why it is no coincidence that M. Bulgakov exposes contrast between a young man in a cap and a chief in a pork-pie hat.

The TT in German says that a middle-aged man was wearing a pork-pie hat that looked like pastry (‘wie eine Pirogge’). It could be interpreted as caricature of new intelligentsia wishing to take on bourgeois chic. We are inclined to think that there is no satirical shade of meaning in the ST. The fact that M. Berlioz’s hat is compared with some pastry results from incorrect decoding of the ST. Russian set expression “шляпа пирожком” (a patty-shaped hat) denotes none other than a hat that, according to Garbovskiy, «напоминает пирожок, т.е. она имеет сверху довольно глубокую продолговатую впадину» (‘looks like a patty as there is a long deep dent on top of it’) (2004: 522). Thus a patty-shaped hat is traditional head-dress of Soviet senior executives, in this case, particularly, the editor-in-chief of a reputable magazine – M. Berlioz. It is obviously not a satirical piece of clothing that is implied in German TTs. Besides, this claim seems fully reasonable due to the fact that a hat in *The Master and Margarita* is viewed as an unfailing attribute of a successful man enjoying high social status. For instance, a pseudo-foreigner who throws his money about also wears a hat:

«Низенький, совершенно квадратный человек, бритый до синева, в роговых очках, в новенькой **шляпе**, не измятой и без подтеков на ленте, в сиреновом пальто и лайковых рыжих перчатках, стоял у прилавка и что-то повелительно мычал». (Булгаков 1988, 337)

Ilf and Petrov depict a successful Soviet representative of intelligentsia wearing the same hat:

«Инженер-краснознаменец сдвинул на затылок большую фетровую шляпу, схватил молот с длинной ручкой, и, сделав плачущее лицо, ударил прямо по земле... Самый последний костыль в какие-то полчаса заложил начальник строительства». (1991b: 437)

English translators rendered the Soviet culturonym “шляпа пирожком” (a patty-shaped hat) in a different way. They employed the equivalent “pork-pie hat”, i.e. a felt hat with a round flat crown and soft brims but without a long dent inside. Still the symbolic meaning of the Soviet semiotic culture subcode is beyond the scope of the English translator. In modern English society such hats are considered to be image attributes of jazz musicians¹⁴ not the authorities.

One more specific problem in the Soviet society of the 1930s – the period described in the novel – is the lack of housing or, as they used to say, “housing question”. Here we present the passages from the source and the TTs of *The Master and Margarita* that convey the topic in question.

- (5) *ST*: ...можно было увидеть надпись на двери, в которую ежесекундно ломился народ: «**Квартирный вопрос**». (58)
TT (a) – ... one could see the inscription on the door people were trying to force the way into at every moment: “**Housing Question**” (54-55)
TT (b) – ... was a door under constant siege labelled ‘**Housing Problem**’ (69)
TT (c) – ...konnte man die Aufschrift der Tür lesen, an die das Volk alle Sekunde anklopfte: “**Wohnungsfrage**” (58-59)
TT (d) – ...konnte man die Aufschrift einer Tür lesen, deren Klinke einer dem andern in die Hand gab: “**Wohnungsangelegenheiten**”. (72);
ST: ... обычные люди... в общем, напоминают прежних... **квартирный вопрос** только испортил их... (Булгаков 1988, 125)
TT (a) – ... ordinary people ... All in all they’re reminiscent of the precious ones... it’s just the **housing questions** that spoiled them... (126)
TT (b) – ... they’re ordinary people, in fact they remind me very much of their predecessors, except that the **housing shortage** has soured them ... (147)
TT (c) – ...gewöhnliche Menschen... übrigens erinnern sie mich an die vorherigen... nur die **Wohnungsfrage** hat sie verdorben. (136)
TT (d) – Gewöhnliche Menschen. Erinnern an die von früher, bloß die **Wohnungsfrage** hat sie verdorben. (158)

Loan translations of Russian linguoculturonym “квартирный вопрос” employed in German versions lack the expression that is inherent in the word combination as viewed by Soviet people. It was especially relevant in early Soviet period depicted in the novel. In Pasternak’s *Doctor Zhivago* one can see the drama of such phenomena with the “question” component that were topical within sociocultural scope of early-Soviet discourse and deeply rooted in the mentality:

«Нависало неотвратимое. Близилась зима, а в человеческом мире то, похожее на зимнее обмирание, предрешенное, которое носилось в воздухе и было у всех на устах. Надо было готовиться к холодам, запастись пищу, дрова. Но в дни материализма материя превратилась в понятие, пищу и дрова заменил **продовольственный и топливный вопрос**» (2003:193).

From the linguistic point of view the culturonym “housing question” is a bureaucratic word and its transposition into everyday speech is preconditioned by the explication of bureaucratization tendency in social life. A Soviet magazine *Ogonyok* published satirical verses by Dyhovichnyj and Slobodskoj aimed against the use of different clichés with the ‘question’ component:

Он будет два часа жевать «вопрос».
 «Поднять вопрос» – задача не проста ведь, –
 Чтоб мог он «провернуть» его, «поставить»
 Его «ребром» и «во главу угла».
 Чтоб «заострял» «со всею остротою»
 И чтоб «вопрос» он «вскрыл и рассмотрел»,
 Насколько «наболел» он и «назрел»... (1950: 31)

Now we turn back to the analysis of translation versions of the passage from *The Master and Margarita*. Loan translations employed by German translators are emotionally neutral¹⁵ and do not correspond to expressive modality of the ST. We consider this fact as semantic compression of the culturonym “квартирный вопрос” (“housing question”) that is determined by differences in Russian and German mentalities in the process of decoding the semiotic culture subcode.

An English translator M. Glenny decides in favour of two different equivalents: “Housing Problem”/ “housing shortage”. It proves that within the scope of his mentality there is no idea of any ideological clichés and stereotypes concerning the situation in question. Both translation versions render the semes ‘Challenges to get the housing’ and ‘Housing shortage’ but fail to convey the expressive component. H. Aplin employs other variants (“Housing Question”/ “housing questions”) that render the formal tone (not the emotional one!) of the source culturonym. For this reason these variants are communicatively adequate.

Analysis of semiotic culture subcodes in interpersonal communication of Soviet people in 1930s

Now we consider several examples of semiotic culture subcodes related to the sphere of interpersonal communication of Soviet people taken from English and German translation versions of *The Master and Margarita*. The analysis serves to reveal to what extent the passages express the differences in mentalities of Russian, English and German linguocultures.

Everyday words that are generally used to denote a person serve a vivid example of differences in mentalities of SL and TL native speakers:

- (6) ST: Однажды весной, в час небывало жаркого заката, в Москве, на Патриарших прудах, появились **два гражданина**. (11)
 TT (a) – At the hour of hot spring sunset at Patriarch’s Ponds two **citizens** appeared. (5)
 TT (b) – At the sunset hour of one warm spring day two **men** were to be seen at Patriarch’s Ponds. (13)
 TT (c) – Eines Frühlings, zu der Zeit eines nie dagewesenen, heißen Sonnenuntergangs, in Moskau, an den Patriarchenteichen, erschienen zwei **Bürger** (5)
 TT (d) – An einem ungewöhnlich heißen Frühlingstag erschienen bei Sonnenuntergang auf dem Moskauer Patriarchenteichboulevard zwei **Männer**. (11);
 ST: **Гражданин**, опять встрял мерзкий регент, – вы что же это волнуете интуриста? (52)
 TT (a) – “**Citizen!**” the loathsome precentor butted in again. “What are you doing, disturbing a foreign tourist?” (48)
 TT (b) – ‘Look here, **citizen**,’ put in the horrible choirmaster again. ‘What do you mean by upsetting this foreign tourist?’ (62)
 TT (c) – “**Bürger!**”, mischte sich der grässliche Chorleiter vom Neuen ein, “warum belästigen sie diesen Intouristen?” (51)
 TT (d) – “**Bürger!**” quasselte wieder der miese Kantor dazwischen. “Was belästigen Sie den ausländischen Touristen?” (64);
 ST: - Ваши удостоверения, **граждане**, – сказала **гражданка**. (342) TT (a) – “You identification cards?” **the citizeness** repeated. (360)
 TT (b) – ‘You membership cards, please,’ said **the woman**. (398)
 TT (c) – “Ihre Berechtigungsscheine?”, wiederholte **die Bürgerin**. (385)

TT (d) – “Ihre Ausweise, **Bürger**”, sagte **die Frauensperson**. (440)

So in 1920s-30s the use of the words “гражданин” / “гражданка” (“citizen” / “citizeness”) was a common communicative practice in the USSR. A noted Russian linguist Vvedenskaja suggests:

«В 20-30-е гг. появился обычай, а затем стало нормой при обращении арестованных, заключенных, судимых к работникам органов правопорядка и наоборот не говорить *товарищ*, а только *гражданин*: *гражданин подследственный, гражданин судья, гражданин прокурор*. В результате слово *гражданин* для многих стало ассоциироваться с задержанием, арестом, милицией, прокуратурой. Негативная ассоциация постепенно так «приросла» к слову, что стала его неотъемлемой частью». (‘In 1920s-30s it became a custom, then a conventional norm for the arrested, imprisoned and convicted not to address officers in law-enforcement authorities and vice versa as *comrade*. The conventional way to address was only *citizen: the investigated citizen, the judge citizen, the prosecutor citizen*. As a result of this the word citizen acquired association links with detention, arrest, police and public prosecutor's office. Eventually the negative association became so deeply rooted in the word that it turned to be its inherent component.’) (2004: 304-305)

This aspect of semantics typical of the lexeme is reflected in literary sources on the period of Soviet history in question:

- (7) «Разрешите сказать, **гражданин** начальник...» (Солженицын 2006а, 442)
- Здравствуйте, **гражданин** начальник!
А тот укоризненно качал головой:
- Нет, - нет, какой же может быть «**гражданин**»! Я для вас теперь товарищ, вы уже не заключенные (Солженицын 2006а, 337)

But in the speech usus of the 1920s-30s any man could be called “a citizen”. It demonstrates the phenomena typical of that time: the spirit of suspiciousness, presumption of guilt and total control over everything in the country exercised by NKVD (The Peoples Commissariat for Internal Affairs). So Ilf and Petrov refer to this word in situations concerned with economic activity of the member of Soviet society; the activity as nothing to do with the law enforcement sphere: «К **гражданину** из первого ряда сейчас же принеслась девица с квитанцией для получения денег ¹⁶». (1991а:118); «С другой стороны упаковочная контора «Быстроупак» извещала о себе уважаемых **граждан-заказчиков** черной вывеской с золотыми буквами». (1991а:46).

The connotation of the lexeme “гражданин” (“a citizen”) is not registered (probably for ideological reasons) in Soviet explanatory dictionaries dated to the period of writing the novel. *The Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language* after Ushakov gives the following meanings of the word in question:

1. Подданный какого-либо государства.
2. Сознательный член общества; человек, подчиняющий свои личные интересы общественным. (риторич.).
3. Взрослый человек, мужчина (нов.), формула обращения к мужчине. (1935-40:613-614)

In English and German versions of *The Master and Margarita* the official name for a person “гражданин” / “гражданка” (“citizen” / “citizeness”) is supplied with different

equivalents in the TL. We have revealed the following tendency in early translation versions by M. Glenny and T. Reschke: if the address is under formal conditions the lexeme in question is rendered with such equivalents as “citizen”/ “Bürger” but in declarative passages they are substituted by “man” / “woman” и “Mann” / “Frauensperson”. Most probably they referred to descriptions of culturonym semantics given in Soviet explanatory dictionaries synchronic to the period when the novel was written.

The algorithm of such translation decision has nothing to do with any conventional procedures of searching the equivalent for a foreign culture reality: English and German explanatory dictionaries and bilingual Russian-English and Russian-German lexicographical sources do not differentiate the equivalents for “гражданин” / “гражданка” (“citizen” / “citizenship”) as regards their communicative distribution and the function realized, i.e. it is not codified in any source that if the words are used in a declarative passage they have stylistically neutral equivalents “man” / “woman” and “Mann” / “Frauensperson”; but if the lexemes are employed as address one should opt for “citizen”/ “Bürger” equivalents. It is reasonable to assume that the leading factor in such case is the subjective associations of a translator that determine adequacy or inadequacy of the equivalent in the created image-gestalt of the communicative context presented in the ST. Thus, the examples display reflection on the part of a translator as regards the culturonym “гражданин” (“a citizen”). It seems highly probable that the reflection had different interpretation in the SL and the TL cultures in 1960s.

H. Aplin and E. Boerner, the translators of *The Master and Margarita* in the beginning of XXI c., render early-Soviet nominations “гражданин” / “гражданка” (“citizen” / “citizenship”) in a different way. They employ the equivalents “citizen”/ “Bürger” both in declarative sentences and addresses. This approach seems communicatively adequate and could be interpreted as a deeper understanding of semiotic culture subcode by translators. The fact could result from more significant intercultural transparency of post-Soviet area after the Cold war.

Rudeness of salespeople in the trade sector, also depicted in the novel, was a typical feature of everyday life in the Soviet period. So newspaper *Trud* dated 1928 reports about outrageous carelessness to clients:

Вот образцы вопросов покупателей и “вежливых” ответов продавцов:

- Какая будет мука? – Какая будет, такую и возьмете.
- Когда откроется магазин? – Катитесь, еще не скоро.
- Когда привезут муку? – Когда привезут, тогда и будет.
- Где же достать галоши? – Ходи без галош. (1928, 19 апреля:4)

Here we turn to the passage from the novel depicting a situation typical of everyday communication in Soviet times:

- (8) *ST*: Дайте **нарзану**, – попросил Берлиоз.
 - **Нарзану нету**, – ответила женщина в будочке и почему-то обиделась. (12)
TT (a) – “**Narzan**, please”, requested Berlioz.
 “**There’s no Narzan**,” replied the woman in the booth, and for some reason took umbrage. (5)
TT (b) – ‘**A glass of lemonade**, please,’ said Berlioz.
 ‘**There isn’t any**,’ replied the woman in the kiosk. For some reason the request seemed to offend her. (13)

TT (c) – “Einmal **Narsan**”, bestellte Berlioz.

“**Narsan** haben wir nicht”, antwortete die Frau im Büdchen und schien aus irgendeinem Grunde beleidigt. (6)

TT (d) – “**Narsan** bitte”, sagte Berlioz.

“**Ham wir nicht**”, antwortete die Frau im Büdchen und war komischerweise beleidigt. (12)

Some researches that analyzed M. Bulgakov’s works note that this scene of buying soft drinks emphasizes negative evaluation of Moscow everyday life. Belobrovceva and Kul’jus claim: «Отсутствие в жару прохладительного “нарзану” оказывается интродукцией к важнейшей для М. Булгакова теме полного отсутствия в Москве даже предпосылок для нормальной жизни». (‘The case when there is no refreshing “нарзану” (‘Narzan’) in such hot weather serves as introduction to an extremely relevant topic for M. Bulgakov – no prerequisites for normal life’). (2007:154)

Esakova states that interesting linguocultural information is conveyed in the case form ‘нарзану’:

В русском языке есть немало слов, которые в форме родительного падежа обозначают некоторую, неопределенную часть целого (значение партитивности). Многие существительные мужского рода для обозначения партитивности имеют два варианта форм: с флексией -а и с флексией -у. Наличие двух форм для одного значения предполагает стилистическую вариативность... Таким образом, получается, что форма «нарзану» – форма разговорного языка. (‘There are a lot of words in the Russian language that denote some indefinite part of the whole in the genitive case (partitive meaning). Many masculine nouns have two forms to convey partitive meaning: with ‘-a’ inflection and ‘-y’ inflection. Two forms for one meaning presuppose stylistic variability... So the form with the ‘-y’ inflection is common in colloquial style.’) (2002: 94-95)

This stylistic shade is not rendered in English version translated by M. Glenny. It leads to misinterpretation. A reader cannot grasp any satirical subtext in the dialogue between the head of MASSOLIT M. Berlioz and a woman selling soft drinks: they refer to partitive genitive case “нарзану” and colloquially rude refusal form “нету” (“no”). This clash of stylistically marked forms renders certain hostile attitude of salespeople to customers that was characteristic of everyday life in the USSR and is viewed by M. Bulgakov as a specific subcode of Soviet culture¹⁷. A more categorical form with absolute negation chosen by H. Aplin can be considered a suitable equivalent in the current communicative situation. It conveys greater emotional appeal than the neutral construction employed by M. Glenny. The validity of our assumption is verified by the fact that the feeling for the language made L. Volokhonsky¹⁸, an American translator Russian by birth, opt for the same grammar construction in the passage – ‘no’:

(9) – ‘Give us seltzer,’ Berlioz asked.

‘**There is no seltzer,**’ the woman in the stand said, and for some reason became offended. (Bulgakov 2007: 7)

A German translator T. Reschke was more accurate in rendering somewhat rude colloquial shade of meaning in salesperson’s remark. He failed to decode the connotation of lexeme “нарзану” but the form “нету” (“no”) is rendered by a communicatively adequate German

verb “ham” with colloquial connotation. In a later German translation by E. Boerner the culturonym in point is completely overlooked. The informal charge of the ST is not compensated and one can conclude that E. Boerner’s equivalent is less communicatively adequate than the one supplied by T. Reschke.

One more distinctive mentality feature immanent in characters of *The Master and Margarita* that lived in 1930s, and Soviet people as well, is xenophobia, dislike of people from other countries. Russian philologists I. Belobrovceva and S. Kul’jus note that the manifestations of such attitude to everything foreign “are shown in Bulgakov’s novel not only as justified by official ideology but cultivated by it”. (2007: 166). In those times a foreigner was one of numerous enemies who according to the mythology of Stalin’s epoch was a representative of “foreign capitalist hell” opposed to “Soviet socialist paradise”. Here we can see how these tendencies in Soviet society are shown in *The Master and Margarita* and how this SCC is expressed in English and German TTs:

(10) *ST*: - Вот что, Миша, – зашептал поэт, оттащив Берлиоза в сторону, – он никакой не **интурист**, а шпион. Это русский эмигрант, перебравшийся к нам. Спрашивай у него документы, а то уйдет... (21)

TT (a) – “You know what, Misha,” began the poet in a whisper, pulling Berlioz aside, “he’s no **foreign tourist**, but a spy. He’s a Russian émigré who’s made his way back over here. Ask for his papers, otherwise he’ll be off...” (15)

TT (b) – ‘Look here, Misha,’ whispered the poet when he had drawn Berlioz aside. ‘He’s not just a **foreign tourist**, he’s a spy. He’s a Russian émigré and he’s trying to catch us out. Ask him for his papers and then he’ll go away...’ (24)

TT (c) – “Da hast du’s, Mischa”, flüsterte der Dichter, nachdem er Berlioz zur Seite gezogen hatte, “Das ist keinesfalls ein **Intourist**, sondern ein Spion. Das ist ein russischer Emigrant, der sich bei uns eingeschlichen hat. Frag ihn nach seinen Dokumenten und weg ist er...” (16)

TT (d) – “Hör mal, Mischa”, raunte der Lyriker, nachdem er Berlioz beiseite gezogen hatte, “ der ist kein **Tourist**, sondern ein Spion, ein russischer Emigrant, der zu uns eingeschleust wurde. Frag ihn doch gleich mal nach seinen Papieren, sonst entkommt er noch.” (24)

We have set off the lexeme “интурист” (“an intourist”) in bold. It is a contracted form of the word combination “иностранный турист” (“a foreign tourist”) that represents a Soviet ideologeme conveying hostile attitude to foreigners in the USSR. It was a kind of a label to denote a man one should keep at some distance and avoid communication with. English and German translators of the novel overlooked this sociocultural connotation of the word “интурист” (“an intourist”), at least it is not expressed in the TT verbally as the English equivalent of the word in point – “foreign tourist” – and the German equivalent – “Tourist” (T. Reschke’s version) are neutral as regards ideological connotation.

Our observations on the connotative features of the lexeme “интурист” are verified by comments of one of the characters in the novel. See the passage below:

(11) *ST*: - Говорю вам, капризен, как черт знает что! – зашептал Коровьев, – ну не желает! Не любит он гостиниц! Вот они где у меня сидят, эти **интуристы**! – интимно пожаловался Коровьев, тыча пальцем в свою жилистую шею, – верите ли, всю душу вымотали! Приедет... и или нашипионит, как последний сукин сын, или же капризами все нервы вымотает: и то ему не так, и это не так!.. (98-99)

Having read the passage one can come to the conclusion that the version by a Soviet translator in no way renders respectful treatment of the customer – a foreign tourist. It conveys the general atmosphere of xenophobia, spy mania and total suspiciousness that shape interpersonal communication between Soviet people in 1920s-1930s as they are depicted in Bulgakov's novel.

Remarks about hostile attitude to foreigners can be found with writers contemporary with M. Bulgakov. So I. Ilf and E. Petrov tell that in those times it was not desirable to have relatives abroad, even communication with foreigners was not welcomed:

- (12) - А вы на «Студебеккере»?
- Можете считать нашу машину «Студебеккером», – сказал Остап злобно, – но до сих пор она называлась «Лорен-Дитрих». Вы удовлетворены?
Но шофер-любитель удовлетворен не был.
- Позвольте, – воскликнул он с юношеской назойливостью, – но ведь в пробеге нет никаких «Лорен-Дитрихов». Я читал в газете, что идут два «Паккарда», два «Фиата» и один «Студебеккер».
- Идите к чертовой матери со своим Студебеккером! – заорал Остап. – **Кто такой Студебеккер? Это ваш родственник, Студебеккер? Папа ваш Студебеккер?** Чего вы прицепились к человеку?! Русским языком ему говорят, что «Студебеккер» в последний момент заменен «Лорен-Дитрихом», а он морочит голову. Студебеккер! Студебеккер! (Ilf, Petrov 1991b:280)

A foreign tourist for a Soviet man of Bulgakov's period is not only a spy or an enemy but the embodiment of material welfare that was so badly wished by USSR citizens of that time. And that was the reason to hate:

- (13) «Откуда он приехал? Зачем? Скучали мы, что ли, без него? Приглашали мы его, что ли? Конечно, – саркастически кривя рот, во весь голос орал бывший регент, – он, видите ли, в парадном сиреневом костюме, от лососины весь распух, он весь набит валютой, а нашему-то, нашему-то?!» (Bulgakov 1988: 340)

Just as in the previous example English and German versions are deprived of cultural-and-semiotic marking of the lexeme and the translators opt for neutral translational equivalents “foreign tourist” and “Tourist” (in TT (d)). We believe that E. Boerner's variant “Intourist” is not ideal either as the lexeme is alien to German-speaking recipients and it does not evoke cultural connotations conveyed in the ST.

Concluding remarks

The main findings of the study reveal that adequate decoding of SCCs and selecting their equivalents in the TL and culture in the course of Russian-English and Russian-German translation of *The Master and Margarita* after M. Bulgakov is the indispensable condition for producing a communicatively equivalent TT with the focus on the target culture mentality. Our observations on microcontexts that convey the main SCCs characterizing the mentality of a Soviet man in 1930s – “Material items of everyday life” or “Interpersonal communication” – show that as regards the author of the ST and English and German translators in most cases these codes are equivalent but not completely identical. What really matters is the reflection on

the part of translator while rendering SCCs. The process entails recognition of differentiating features that are addressed to in a translational act between languages and cultures.

One should admit the fact that many losses in rendering implicit information that characterizes the mentality of a Soviet man in *The Master and Margarita* after M. Bulgakov result from objective reasons. As Garbovskiy states they are mainly preconditioned by « системными межъязыковыми различиями, асимметрий культурных реалий и стилистическими нормами» ('systemic interlingual differences, asymmetry of culture realia and stylistic norms') (2004: 283). But to a considerable degree the translation decision in favour of this or that equivalent in rendering SCCs is mainly guided by subjective factors, i.e. the capability of a translator to adequately decode and not to contradict the intentions implied by the author of the ST.

Notes:

¹ English versions of M. Bulgakov's novel were translated by Michael Glenny (TT (b) in 1967 and Hugh Aplin (TT (a) in 2008, German versions of the novel – by German translators Thomas Reschke (TT (d) in 1968 and Eric Boerner (TT (c) in 2012. These versions of almost classical Russian novel translated at different times give some idea of the dynamics in comprehension of SCCs in British and German societies. M. Glenny's translation became classical; it was republished many times in Great Britain and the USA. T. Reschke's translation could also be considered classical, the one that crossed the borders and different social formations; it was republished many times both in German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany and present-day Germany. New translations of the novel are not well-known. Thus H. Aplin's translation was published in 2008 by Oneworld Classics Ltd. Hugh Aplin was a nominee of "Academia Rossica" 2009 award for the best Russian –English translation of a fiction book. Besides Bulgakov's novels H. Aplin translated F. Dostoevsky and A. Chekhov. E. Boerner is a well-known contemporary translator from Russian, English and French into German. He translated poetry and fiction works by A. Pushkin, S. Yesenin. N. Gumilev, A. Chekhov, M. Bulgakov, I. Babel and others. E. Boerner's translation of *The Master and Margarita* was published by an unfamiliar publishing house in Norderstedt.

² We do not identify culturonyms as the media of SCCs in the text with realia, i.e. nominations of "particular elements of culture (even original and exotic ones)" (Esakova 2002:92). Culturonyms and realia have only partial intersection. There are cases when (i) one and the same lexeme serves as a reality and a culturonym (e.g. the toponym-reality Solovki that was associated in early soviet discourse with the place of exile for political prisoners), (ii) a culturonym does not refer to the reality class and it does not pose any difficulties for translation (e.g. this is the case in three microcontexts from the novel, the ones in which "кепка" ("a cap") serves as a symbol of Proletarian origin), (iii) a reality is not a culturonym as it does not convey any axiological connotations (the fact can be exemplified by contexts with the reality "нарзан" ("narzan") (Bulgakov 1988:12)). The subject of the present analysis is presented by lexemes that refer to the first two types.

³ The reflective activity of the English version of the novel is viewed in the context of British linguoculture as M. Glenny and H. Aplin are from Great Britain.

⁴ Such differences in positions are determined by belonging to different cultures.

⁵ Such reflective position is a special case of metametasemiotic activity at comprehension of the TT by the SL speaker.

⁶ Such approach enhances the revealing of a greater number of peculiarities typical of national mentality of the SL speaker in case there is comparison with a big number of translated metatext-invariants in other languages.

⁷ We believe that bilingual translators have a more adequate presentation of SCCs in the TT.

⁸ We have chosen the most demonstrative sources to verify this or that parameter of Soviet mentality according to English and German translation reflection in the examples under analysis.

⁹ The survey of informants-TL speakers shows that only variants “imperial chitterlings” and “chicken a la King” are interpreted as expensive dishes. But it only partially fills in the semiotic lacuna.

¹⁰ In his travel notes a French writer A. Gide describes a dramatic contrast between the luxury of Soviet elite that has dinner parties in exclusive restaurants at an average cost of 300 rub. and the poverty of ordinary Soviet people that earn no more than 4-5 rub. a day (Gide1990:589-590). V. Mayakovsky in his poem *Дом Герцена* (1928) also depicts the luxury of Soviet writers with disapproval.

¹¹ Here and after we use the materials verifying the adequacy of identification of SCCs in the SL with the aim to fully convey the language structure and socio-cultural uniqueness.

¹² see (Multitran. German-Russian dictionary, http://www.multitran.ru/s/m/exe?t=85927_3_2)

¹³ see (Great Britain: Language and Culture dictionary 91).

¹⁴ see (Pork-pie hat, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pork_pie_hat).

¹⁵ German lexemes “Wohnungsangelegenheit” and “Wohnungsfrage” are equivalents of the word “вопрос” (“question”) and are used in formal style. But the emotional peculiarity of the source culturonym is somehow eliminated in case they are used in translation.

¹⁶ The topic is about the auction.

¹⁷ M. Esakova notes that the culturonym ‘Hostile attitude of salespeople to customers’ is out-of-date in French version of *The Master and Margarita* (Esakova 2002:95).

¹⁸ L. Volokhonsky is the co-author of the translation version under analysis (Bulgakov 1997).

References:

BELOBROVCEVA, Irina, KUL'JUS, Svetlana. 2007. *Роман М. Булгакова “Мастер и Маргарита”*. *Комментарий*. Москва: Книжный клуб 36.6, 2007.

BULGAKOV, Mikhail. 1988. *Мастер и Маргарита*. Москва: Советская литература, 1988.

BULGAKOV, Mikhail. 1989. *Чаша жизни: Повести, рассказы, пьеса, очерки, фельетоны, письма*. Москва: Советская Россия, 1989.

BULGAKOV, Mikhail. 1997. *The Master and Margarita*. Trans. R. Pevear and L. Volokhonsky. London: Penguin Books, 1997.

DRIDZE, Tamara. 1980. *Язык и социальная психология*. Москва: Высшая школа, 1980.

DYHOVICHNYJ, Vladimir, SLOBODSKOJ, Moris. 1950. Зачем мы так говорим? In *Огонек* №51. p. 31.

ESAKOVA, Maria. 2002. Межкультурная асимметрия как переводческая проблема. In *Вестник Московского государственного университета*. Серия 19. № 2. pp. 91-99.

GARBOVSKIY, Nikolay. 2004. *Теория перевода*. Москва: МГУ, 2004.

GARBOVSKIY, Nikolay, KOSTIKOVA, Olga. 2012. *Science of Translation Today: Change of Scientific Paradigm*. In *Meta: Translator's Journal*, Vol. 57. No. 1. pp. 48-66.

GIDE, Andre. 1990. Возвращение из СССР In: ЖИД, А. *Подземелья ватикана. Фальшивомонетки. Возвращение из СССР*. Москва: Московский рабочий, 1990. pp. 519-618.

ILF, Иуа, PETROV, Evgeniy. 1991a. Двенадцать стульев. In: ИЛЬФ, И., ПЕТРОВ, Е. *Двенадцать стульев. Золотой теленок*. Элиста: Калмыцкое книжное издательство. pp. 3-234.

ILF, Иуа, PETROV, Evgeniy. 1991b “Золотой теленок.” In: ИЛЬФ, И., ПЕТРОВ, Е. *Двенадцать стульев. Золотой теленок*. Элиста: Калмыцкое книжное издательство. pp. 235-480.

КАВАКЧИ, Victor. 2001. *Практика англоязычной межкультурной коммуникации*. Санкт Петербург: Союз, 2001.

KOMISSAROV, Vilen. 2001. *Современное переводоведение*. Москва: ЭТС, 2001.

LOTMAN, Yuri. 2000. *Семиосфера*. Санкт Петербург: Искусство-СПб, 2000.

MAYAKOVSKY, Vladimir. 1978. Дом Герцена. Москва: Правда, 1978. Т. 5. In: МАЯКОВСКИЙ, В.В. *Собрание сочинений в 12-ти т.* Москва: Правда, 1978. pp. 162-164.

PASTERNAK, Boris. 2003. *Доктор Живаго*. Санкт Петербург: Кристалл, 2003.

PORK-PIE HAT Available at: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pork_pie_hat>.

PROHOROV, Yuri, STERNIN, Iosif. 2007. *Русские: коммуникативное поведение*. Москва: Флинта: Наука, 2007.

SHCHEDROVITSKY, Georgiy. 2005. Рефлексия в деятельности. In: ПИСКОПЕЛЬ, А., ЩЕДРОВИЦКИЙ, Г. (ред.). *Мышление. Понимание. Рефлексия*. Москва: Наследие МКК, 2005. pp. 64-125.

SHCHEDROVITSKY, Georgiy. 2006. *Понимание и мышление. Смысл и содержание*. Москва: Восточная литература. 2006.

SOLZHENITSYN, Alexander. 2006. *В круге первом*. Москва: Издательство “Наука”, 2006.

STURGE, Kate. 2009. Cultural translation. In BAKER, M., SALDANHA, G. (eds.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2009. pp. 67-70.

USHAKOV, Dmitry. 1935-40. *Толковый словарь русского языка*. Москва: ОГИЗ. Т 1. в 4-х т., 1935-40.

VENUTI, Lawrence. 1992. *Rethinking Translation*. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.

VVEDENSKAJA, Ludmila. 2004. *Культура речи*. Ростов-на-Дону: Феникс, 2004.

YIFENG, Sun. 2006. Translating Foreign Otherness. In *Across Languages and Cultures* Vol. 7. No. 1. pp. 23-36.

RUM, Adrian, KOLESNIKOV, Leonid. 1980. *Великобритания: Лингвострановедческий словарь*. 1-е изд. Москва: Русский язык, 1980.

MULTITRAN. *Немецко-русский словарь*. Available at: <http://www.multitran.ru/s/m/exe?t=85927_3_2>.

“У прилавка неблагополучно.” In *Труд*, 19 Апр. 1928. p. 4.

Sources:

BULGAKOV, Mikhail. 2008. *The Master and Margarita*. Trans. H. Aplin. London: One world Classics LTD, 2008.

BULGAKOV, Mikhail. 2004. *The Master and Margarita*. Trans. M. Glenny. London: Vintage, 2004.

BULGAKOV, Mikhail. 1988. *Мастер и Маргарита*. Москва: Советская литература, 1988.

BULGAKOW, Mikhail. 2012. *Der Meister und Margarita*. Trans. E. Boerner. Norderstedt: Norderstedt Books on Demand, 2012.

BULGAKOW, Mikhail. 2008. *Der Meister und Margarita*. Trans. T. Reschke. München: Random House, 2008.

Alexandra Milostivaya

*Department of Translation Studies,
North-Caucasus Federal University
Pushkina 1, Stavropol, 355009, Russia
Phone: +7 (8652) 358206, Fax: +7 (8652) 353710
E-mail: xyscha@mail.ru*

Tatiana Marchenko

*Department of Translation Studies,
North-Caucasus Federal University
Pushkina 1, Stavropol, 355009, Russia
Phone: +7 (8652) 358206, Fax: +7 (8652) 353710
E-mail: tatiana-marchenko-25@yandex.ru*

In SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation [online]. 2014, vol. 7, no. 1 [cit. 2014-29-12]. Available online <http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTI08/pdf_doc/04.pdf>. ISSN 1336-7811