NATALIA KALOH VID

ZORA ◦ 76

Ideological Translations of Robert Burns's Poetry in Russia and in the Soviet Union

ZORA
76

Natalia Kaloh Vid

Ideological Translations of Robert Burns's Poetry
in Russia and in the Soviet Union

Mednarodna knjižna zbirka ZORA

Knjiga je izšla s finančno pomočjo Javne agencije za knjigo Republike Slovenije.

ZORA
76

Natalia Kaloh Vid

Ideological Translations of Robert Burns's Poetry in Russia and in the Soviet Union

Bielsko-Biała, Budapest, Kansas, Maribor, Praha
2011

ZORA
76

Natalia Kaloh Vid

Ideological Translations of Robert Burns's Poetry
in Russia and in the Soviet Union

Izdala in založila
Mednarodna založba
Oddelka za slovanske jezike in književnosti,
Filozofska fakulteta, Univerza v Mariboru

Za založbo
Marko Jesenšek

Recenzenta
Red. prof. dr. Victor Kennedy
Doc. dr. Darja Darinka Hribar

Lektoriranje
Kirsten Margaret Hempkin

Slika na naslovnici
Ida Brišnik Remec, akademska slikarka
ZL-B3, 1976

Grafična priprava
Katarina Visočnik

Naklada
300 izvodov

Tisk
Dravska tiskarna

Maribor 2011

CIP – Kataložni zapis o publikaciji
Univerzitetna knjižnica Maribor

81'255.4:821.111.09Burns R.=161.1

KALOH Vid, Natalia
Ideological translations of Robert Burns's poetry in Russia and in the Soviet Union / Natalia Kaloh Vid. – Maribor : Filozofska fakulteta, Mednarodna založba Oddelka za slovanske jezike in književnosti, 2011. – (Mednarodna knjižna zbirka Zora ; 76)

ISBN 978-961-6656-64-1

COBISS.SI-ID 66779649 ISBN 978-961-6656-64-1

Contents

Acknowledgments

First of all, I wish to thank Dr. Victor Kennedy and Dr. Michelle Gadpaille who encouraged me to do this research while I was a student, urging me to think broadly while still attending to crucial details. Their gifts of support, humor, perspective, and friendship are still treasured possessions I carry with me. For me, they are model scholars and teachers.

Other colleagues have been sources of commentary critique and support. I wish to thank Dr. Gerard Garruthers, the director of the Centre for Robert Burns Studies at the University of Glasgow who agreed to write a forward for this book, and Dr. Kirsteen McCue from the Department of Scottish literature at the University of Glasgow for their enthusiastic assurances that this book will contribute to Burns studies, for their optimism and belief in me. They also generously allowed me to use the library of the department for collecting the material for the first part of the book.

My special thanks go to Frank Shaw, an outstanding person, and one of the most dedicated Burns fans I have ever met, and his wife Susan.

I also wish to thank mag. Kirsten Margaret Hempkin, who kindly agreed to proofread the text.

My biggest debt in my professional life in general, and in the production of this book in particular, is to the moral and material support of my family: my husband Dejan and my parents, Leonard and Natalia Vid.

Foreword

Robert Burns's relationship with Russia has been more cited than studied. Too often in the past the referencing of Burns's popularity in Russia does little more than suggest an easy accommodation between the poet and the people (of Russia) based on an easily shared proletarian sensibility. Here for the first time in Natalia Kaloh Vid's book is an extended scholarly treatment of Burns and Russia. What she analyses with some precision is the 'translation' of Burns for Russian consumption that implies something far beyond merely crossing the language barrier. Natalia Kaloh Vid points us to the 'correction', the 'improvement' of Burns by Russian translators, speaking often of an ideological project that complicates the supposedly transparent kinship between Burns and the Russian people. Anglophone scholars of Burns have all heard of Marshak, a few know a little of Ivan Kozlov, the early nineteenth century translator of the poet. Beyond the Romantic period however, others such as Dmitry Minaev or Vsevolod Kostomorav in the mid nineteenth century have remained almost unknown to Burns scholarship. Interestingly, one argument that it is possible to deduce from Dr Kaloh Vid's fascinating history of Burns translation in history that these nineteenth century translators even as they adapted Burns's work to suit indigenous Russian nativist expression, operated in fairly faithful fashion. On the other hand Marshak, often spoken approvingly of in Scotland, as transmitter, purveyor of Burns's genius, begins to appear culpable of graven ideological interference. It is to Dr Kaloh Vid's credit, however, that Marshak's ideological interference is set alongside his enormous energies as a Burns translator, which, arguably, deserves some everlasting credit. Dr Kaloh Vid also shows that the ideological dressing up of Burns predates the Soviet era of Marshak and that in imperial Russia there were also aspects of inflation and censorship. This welcome long historical view is something that will be hugely instructive to anyone interested in Burns's politics (including sexual and cultural politics generally, as well as simply the 'constitutional' variety). The post 1991 Russian dispensation threw up

new translators, such as Evegenii Vitkovsky and Evgenii Feldman, refreshing alternative interpreter of Burns who in Dr Kaloh Vid's memorable words broke the 'Marshak monopoly'. What these translators show is that creative freedom rather than ideological allegiance provide the most honest rendition of Burns into a foreign language. Dr Kaloh Vid's book provides a history that needs to be told and a close textual analysis that has not previously been undertaken. Scots and Russian (and other) students of the Scottish bard need to be aware of her landmark work.

Dr Gerard Carruthers
Director, Centre for Robert Burns Studies,
University of Glasgow

Introduction

There is hardly any other poet who is as admired and beloved in Russia as Robert Burns; his poems have been republished and sold millions of copies, while the Russian translation of his songs can be heard in famous films and on TV and radio. The first translations introduced Robert Burns to Russian readers as a sentimental pastoral poet in the nineteenth century, and Russian and Soviet translators continued translating Burns throughout the twentieth century. Burns's apparently insignificant place in Russian literary consciousness in the nineteenth century contrasts sharply with the extraordinary cultural dominance he achieved in the Soviet Union. It is well-known that the first commemorative stamp with Burns's portrait was issued in the Soviet Union in 1956. Burns's popularity reached its peak in the outstanding celebration of the 200th anniversary of his birth in 1959. Ever since, Robert Burns has remained one of the most famous foreign poets in Russia. However, as a foreign poet Burns could have never achieved such extraordinary cultural dominance without successful translation of his work.

This study was sparked, somewhat playfully at first, by what struck me as a remarkable paradox. In spite of the fact that Burns achieved such popularity in the Soviet Union, in a totalitarian state characterized by the enforced propaganda of the prevailing ideology, there are no literary or linguistic analyses of Burns translations which consider the ideological influence. Translations of Burns certainly did not avoid ideological interpretation and adaptation. Ideology played a key role in the translation process in the Soviet Union, which differed greatly from that in democratic societies as it was inevitably influenced by an institution of censorship and strict centralisation. All participants in the translation process (translators, censors, publishers) existed as one united group with clearly determined ideological aims. However, until now the question of ideological influence on the translations of Burns has been largely ignored. Millions of Russian

readers still admire the Soviet translations of Burns without knowing that they are reading ideologically adapted interpretations which are far from the originals.

Of course, at the time of the Soviet totalitarian regime any official scholarly research of the meaning and characteristics of the ideological influence on literary translations could hardly be done. The restrictions of the political regime made it impossible to criticize or even to discuss in any way the overwhelming influence of the leading ideology on all aspects of political, social and cultural life. Existent Soviet studies valued ideological influence as extremely positive; on the other hand, Western academics did not pay enough attention to this field either, because the "iron curtain" made it almost impossible to gain access to any sources of information. In the late twentieth and beginning of the twenty-first century, after the fall of most totalitarian countries, including the Soviet Union, the situation changed. The question of the ideological influence which defined culture and literature in the Soviet Union is not a taboo anymore. However, the ideological adaptation of Robert Burns, one of the most famous and beloved foreign poets in the Soviet Union, has attracted little attention.

As I began to think about these issues, I became more and more engaged with the question concerning the ultimate problem of ideological influence on the literary translations of poetic texts, which is well illustrated by the example of Robert Burns. Nevertheless, by focusing on this particular poet, I have taken on a more modest task than that of philosophical speculation on the general effect of ideology on literature. Rather, the main aim of the current research is to examine to what degree and in what way ideology influenced the literary translations of Robert Burns in the Soviet Union and what the consequences of this influence were. In the process of research another interesting issue arose. It turned out that ideologically influenced translations of Burns's poetry are also interesting from a chronological perspective, as Burns was translated throughout different periods of Russian history. In order to relate translations as products and processes to different ideologies within the same society, I decided not to restrict myself to the period of the Soviet Union. Instead, I also took into consideration the first translations of Burns in the nineteenth century, carried out under the influence of the current dominant ideology of absolute monarchy. This dual perspective enabled me to compare the ideological influence on the translations of Burns in the nineteenth century to that in the Soviet Union, a state characterized by its outstandingly powerful personal cult.

As for translations of Burns in modern Russia, it has to be noted that they are somewhat less interesting from the ideological perspective, as in the democratic spirit of new, liberal Russia ideological doctrines no longer influence art, literature and literary translations. The current studies concentrate on the influence of ideology, so modern translations of Burns are mentioned at the end of the last chapter but not analyzed.

It was particularly hard to analyze translations of Burns done in the Soviet Union. There is no doubt that Soviet perception of foreign literature must have been influenced by ideology and censorship. However, the very existence of censorship makes it extremely difficult to assess any documents, apart from translations themselves, such as translators' diaries, letters or any other material which can help us to follow the translation process. Considering this fact, it is almost impossible to know for sure whether certain decisions were taken by the translator with the censor in mind, or with faithfulness to the text in mind. We also should not forget about self-censorship. Therefore, a certain amount of "decoding" over and above questions of translation must be asked, but one can never be sure how much decoding is needed, and sometimes the text may not be encoded at all. I realize that a certain level of speculation over translators' decisions is inevitable in such a close textual analysis. For that reason, I avoided adaptations which could be motivated by other factors rather than the ideological and concentrated instead on the numerous more or less "clear" examples. It was helpful that the main aim of translators in the nineteenth century and in the Soviet epoch was to justify and to legitimize the existing ideology through their translational decisions, not to introduce the new.

The question of ideological influence is rather complex. We all know what ideology means; however, the question of ideological influence on literature and literary translations is not easy to answer. How many ideological elements may a literary work contain and still remain a product of a free author's will? What influence might these elements have on the reader? The ideological approach in translation studies has recently drawn the attention of a number of researchers. The ideology which exists in a specific political system strongly influences the understanding of a foreign culture and literature, which the target reader can recognize mostly through literary translations. Thus, ideology constructs and leads target readers' conceptions and presumptions about foreign cultural environments, which can be positive or negative, depending on the ideological purposes. Exploring ways in which translation reflects a power relationship within the cultural

context, Andre Lefevere suggests (1992: 39) that "on every level of the translation process, it can be shown that, if linguistic considerations enter into conflict with considerations of an ideological and/or poetological nature, the latter tend to win out".

In what follows, the first chapter will provide an overview of the definition of ideology as presented in Karl Marx's theory.

Chapter two offers a theoretical position, basic to the rest of the study. This position examines the relationship between the text and the translator as defined by structuralists and post-structuralists, including C. Schäffner (2003), J. F. Aixela (1996), T. A. van Dijk (2001, 2003) and, M. Calzada-Perez (2003). This chapter will make certain theoretical presuppositions that govern the following interpretive chapters. These include presuppositions about the role and influence of ideology as a result of power relations on translations of poetry and about ideologically motivated translation strategies. The chapter also outlines the methodology which enables the analysis of ideologically motivated elements in poetic texts on the basis of various translation strategies, primarily those of negative and positive impact and of the dominant ideological functions fulfilled by literary translations.

Translation always presumes the crossing of borders – not only linguistic ones, which has always been more or less evident, but also cultural, social, historical, and other borders. It presumes a whole series of interconnected operations and, above all, some form of interpretation. When we speak about ideological influence in literature or in literary translations, we think about the different moral, social and political concepts which an author or a translator consciously or subconsciously interlaces in his/her work and in this way models the readers' views, presumptions and expectations. The degree of ideological influence depends on the historical place and extension of the ideology as well as on the role it is permitted to have in the literary work. Ideological influence as such does not contradict the essence of literature until the moment it starts to dominate literary context or to intentionally direct a reader to ideological doctrines. The degree of ideological influence also does not change from author to author, but depends on the extension and the meaning of an ideology in a specified time and place.

The second chapter also offers a brief introduction to the Critical Discourse Analysis presented in van Dijk's research as one of the types of socio-political analysis of discourse. Van Dijk's perspective requires the analysis of cultural, political and sociological issues and enables us to summarize

the relation between the discourse and the context, including the analysis of dominant ideological functions fulfilled by literary translations, and to define the role of ideologically influenced translation in culture and society. CDA is applicable to the analysis of translated literature at the level of both theory and practice.

Chapter three sketches a brief history of censorship in literature. The goal here is to show that the Soviet Union was not the only country in which censorship played a crucial role in defining the literary market. This chapter also presents the most famous of the books banned or forbidden on ideological grounds, while focusing on the range and scope of significance of the term "censorship".

The fourth chapter introduces the life and work of Robert Burns with particular stress on the role of the vernacular in Burns's poetical works.

Chapter five examines the first translations of Burns carried out in the nineteenth century under the influence of the current ideology of tsarist imperialism. In Tsarist Russia, Burns's poetry was censored primarily because of its revolutionary spirit and passionate appeal to freedom, independence and the struggle against tyranny.

Chapter six was included in the book to clarify the political situation in the Soviet Union and the impact it had on literary translations. The official cultural program of socialist realism and its main purposes are also included here.

Chapter seven examines the translations of Burns done in the Soviet Union by Tat'iana Shchepkina-Kupernik and Samuil Marshak, the best known translator of Burns' work. My argument is that both translators, Marshak in particular, intentionally adapted Burns's poetry following the main ideological demands in order for their work to be published and to avoid conflict with the censors. As a result, their translations contributed to the overall brainwashing process of the enforcing of ideological values and doctrines by evoking a rich set of ideological associations for the audience.

It is hoped that this book will contribute to translation scholarship in two important ways. First of all, analysis of ideologically adapted elements incorporated in translations of Burns opens for examination and discussion what I have come to call *regime literary translations*. By this term I mean translations which contain ideologically unquestionable elements, serve strongly defined ideological purposes and should be considered as a part of

"sotsial'nyi zakaz" (social command). The second contribution I hope this study makes is the interpretation itself, as the findings gathered from the analysis of Burns translations show that literary texts, in this case translated poetry, can offer as much information about the relationship between ideology, power relations and discourse as non-literary texts. The study will focus on the close reading of Burns translations in the ideological discourse and on the ideological effect of these translations. As such, the study may well suggest a way in which the role of ideological influence on literary translations might be seen differently and, perhaps, more clearly.

Chapter One

Conception of Ideology: Marx's Theory

In order to define relationships between ideology and literature and to understand how ideology influenced the whole translation process in the Soviet Union in general and translations of Burns in particular, it is necessary to clarify what ideology actually means and how it functions in society. The field of what has commonly become known as the theory of ideology and its influences in different spheres is diverse and expansive. Diverse definitions of ideology are presented in Gerring's study, *Ideology: a Definitional Analysis* which defines ideology as "a highly flexible conceptual tool" and stresses its, in most cases, contradictional diversity which Gerring defines as "semantic promiscuity" (1997: 957).

The term "ideology" has always been accompanied by its political connotation and defined as an instrument for the legitimization of the power of a dominant social group or class. In one of the most common definitions, found in *The New Oxford Dictionary of English*, ideology is defined as *1. a.* The science of ideas; that department of philosophy or psychology which deals with the origin and nature of ideas. *2. b. spec.* Applied to the system of the French philosopher Condillac, according to which all ideas are derived from sensations *3. c.* The study of the way in which ideas are expressed in language, and *4. e.* Ideal or abstract speculation; in a depreciatory sense, unpractical or visionary theorizing or speculation. Adorno defines ideology as an organization of opinions, attitudes, and values – a way of thinking about man and society (1950: 2). Hamilton states that ideology is "a system of collectively held normative, and reputedly factual ideas and beliefs and attitudes advocating a particular pattern of social relationships and arrangements, and/or aimed at justifying a particular pattern of conduct, which its proponent seeks to promote, realize, pursue or

maintain" (Hamilton 1987: 39). Seliger talks about "sets of ideas by which men posit, explain and justify ends and means of organized social action, and specifically political action, irrespective of whether such action aims to preserve, amend, proof or rebuild a given social order" (Seliger 1976: 11).

Irrespective of different definitions, almost all conceptions of ideology make recourse to Karl Marx's theory, even though it should be noticed that no single Marxist definition of ideology exists, for throughout Marx's writing contradictory views on ideology are raised and interpreted in diverse and dissimilar ways. So far, ideologies as ideas or sets of ideas dependent on material economic conditions may be adjunct primarily to Marx's theory of historical materialism. In *The German Ideology*, the only work of Marx which offers a sustained attempt to identify the problem of ideology and its influence on social structure, the most general definition of ideological corpus may be summarized as the following, "Ideology itself represents the production of ideas, of conceptions, of consciousness /…/ all that men say, imagine, conceive, /…/ and include such things as politics, laws, morality, religion, metaphysics, etc" (2001: 47). Ideology, according to Marx, consists of three elements which must be understood in their totality: the creation of ideas and beliefs by the social consciousness of people as group-member, or by the consciousness of an individual acting as spokesman for a social group (law, art, language); theories elaborated for the conscious justification of a given social situation; and collective illusions, mystifications and false ideas about themselves which people either make up or receive by tradition or education.

In fact, Marx develops two theories of ideology which are potentially in conflict with one another. The first concept is based in the *Preface* and states that ideology is a social category for establishing relations between expressions of social class determined consciousness and the economic basis of social life which is supposed to condition them. In short, each class forms its own system of beliefs, determined by the particular interests of this class (Abercrombie / Hill / Turner 1978: 150–152).

The second theory establishes the economic basis as "the real foundation" of each society upon which, as Marx puts it, "arises a legal and political *superstructure* and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness" (2001: 20). The central category of the "superstructure" which is determined by the base in Marx's social scheme is the ideology which represents conventions and cultural activities that construct ruling ideas of a society and dominate a particular epoch. Considering the fact

that the ruling class of a society controls the economic base (society's means of production), the superstructure of society, as well as its ruling ideas, will be determined according to what is in the ruling class's best interests. The ruling ideas of an epoch "are nothing more that the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships, the dominant material relationships grasped as ideas hence of the relationships which make the one class the ruling one, therefore, the ideas of their dominance" (2001: 64). Consequently, ideology reflects the ideas of the ruling class and supports dominant class advantages.

Nicolas Abercrombie, Stephen Hill and Brian S. Turner suggest that there is a certain contradiction between both ideological aspects. The first suggests that each class forms its own ideology, and the second explains that all classes share one dominant ideology, imposed by the dominant class (1978: 152).

As practice shows, the second explanation of ideology as an intentional creation of some dominant social group (political, cultural or economic) for the purpose of spreading, maintaining or, in extreme political formations, also intruding its perspectives on different visions of reality among themselves and others, is preferred in most political and cultural ideological studies. By extension, each stage of history has its own *ruling class* which enforces its own ideology, so that the class struggle is accompanied by a corresponding battle of ideologies. One of the central points of Marx's theory is criticism of bourgeois ideologies as a distorted expression of inhuman social relations. The importance of this criticism is evident in his description of *Capital* as a "critique of economic categories, or if you like, the system of bourgeois economics exposed in a critical manner" (qtd. in Rabel 1957: 129). Under capitalism, based on commodity practices, capitalist ideology penetrates other classes and must be struggled against by the proletariat.

A dominant ideology justifies itself as self-evident and apparently inevitable, suppresses ideas which might challenge it, excludes any alternatives and presents social reality in ways convenient to itself. This legitimization is managed through the widespread teaching and social adoption of dominant ideologically confirmed ideas. Since one of the main ideological goals is to legitimize the ruling class's authorized position, it tends to obfuscate the violence and exploitation that often keep a disempowered group in its place. Presenting the ideas and values of the dominant class as beliefs of the whole society, ideologies prevent individuals from seeing how society actually functions. A successfully introduced ideology creates an assump-

tion that this dominance is natural and desirable. In extreme formations, as in totalitarian political regimes, ideology serves as an actual instrument for the creation of an illusion of reality, in an effort to gain control over this reality and, thus, over people.

In exploring the essence of the economic base of society, Marxist theory does not deal explicitly with literature and art, nor does it develop an aesthetic of culture or literature. However, control of the material sources of production by a ruling class usually entails the control of intellectual and cultural production as well. In Marx's interpretation, works of literature and art are the products of historical forces that can be analyzed by focusing on the material conditions in which they are formed. Literature, art and other forms of culture are not merely a passive reflection of the economic base but tend to reflect the *class ideology* as such. Although Marx conceded that literature cannot change society, or the base, in itself, he suggested that literature can be an active element in such change. Literature as a cultural production is a form of ideology and one that legitimizes the power of the ruling class[1]. Literature reflects an author's own class or analysis of class relations, however piercing or shallow that analysis may be. So, Marxists generally view literature "not as works created in accordance with timeless artistic criteria, but as 'products' of the economic and ideological determinants specific to that era" (Abrams 1999: 149).

While rigorous Marxism interprets literary texts merely as reflections of specific social conflicts in particular historical periods and their political tendencies, most Marxist criticism has avoided this reductive position, defining literature as a "relatively autonomous" activity, functioning within its own rules of production and reception. In its contribution to ideology literature has not been viewed only as a reflection of specific class interests.

Marx's writings inspired Russian Bolsheviks including Leon Trotsky (1879–1940), Vladimir Lenin (1870–1924) and Anatoly Lunacharsky (1875–1933). Marx's doctrines were revived in the twentieth century by Vladimir Ilich Lenin, who developed and applied them. They became the core of the theory and practice of Bolshevism and the Third International.

[1] In the eighteenth century, for example, literature was used by the English upper classes both to express and to transmit the dominant value systems to the lower classes.

Chapter Two

Ideology in Translation Studies

For a proper understanding of the ideological approach to translation study, it should be noted that language is not only a carrier of messages but also a carrier of culture and culturally important components. The differences in the words of each language surely reflect the important cultural characteristics of the things, customs, and various activities of the society that uses this language. Consequently, translation is not only a process of language transfer but also a process of transplanting the culture. As Eugene Nida (2001: 82) points out: "For truly successful translating, biculturalism is even more important than bilingualism, since words only have meanings in terms of the cultures in which they function." According to Fawcett, "with the spread of deconstruction and cultural studies in the academy, the subject of ideology, and more specifically the ideology of power relations, became an important area of study, and claims about ideology proliferate in many fields, though there are not always well substantiated" (2001: 106). The field of translation presents no exception.

When we speak about ideology in literature or in literary translations, we think about the different moral, social and political concepts which an author or a translator consciously or subconsciously interlaces in his/her work and in this way models the readers' views, presumptions, expectations, etc. The degree of ideological influence depends on the historical place and extension of an ideology as well as on the role it is permitted to have within a literary work. Ideological influence as such does not contradict the essence of literature until the moment this influence starts to dominate literary context or to intentionally direct a reader to ideological doctrines. The degree of ideological influence also does not change from author to author but depends on the extension and the meaning of an ideology in a specified time and place.

Poststructuralist translation theories, including discourse analysis and the functionalist approach, directed attention away from linguistic-influenced approaches towards political and cultural issues, often viewed in a historical context. This widening of translation focus, including social, cultural and historical contexts, has greatly influenced and enhanced a general understanding of translation processes and the role of ideology in translation.

In current translation studies (C. Schäffner 2003; J. F. Aixela 1996, T. A. van Dijk 2001, 2003, M. Calzada-Perez 2003 and S. Bassnett 1996) the process of translation is not regarded as merely passing from one linguistic structure to another but also as transporting one entire culture to another. These scholars emphasize the fact that translation has come into its most important and also its most complex phase: cultural translation. Considering the prevailing translation theories of the last thirty years, translation is now seen as an intercultural communicative behavior. Mary Snell-Hornby notes that as we move toward an understanding of translation that sees it more as a cultural (rather than a linguistic) transfer, the act of translation is no longer "a transcoding from one context into another, but an act of communication" (1990: 82).

The new orientation in translation studies is toward the function of the target text rather than prescriptions of the source text. Thus, the translator must not only be bilingual – that's a given – but effectively bicultural as well. This process automatically includes the importance of the ideology that underlies each translation. M. Calzada-Perez suggests that translation studies dig into ideological phenomena for a variety of reasons. One of the most important reasons is the fact that all language use is, as critical discourse analysis claims, ideological. This means that translation itself as "an operation carried out on language use" is always influenced by ideology (2003: 2). Behind all choices made by a translator is a voluntary act that reveals the translator's socio-political and cultural surrounding. A translator always creates "under pressure of different constraints, ideological, poetical, economical etc, typical of the culture to which he/she belongs" (Alvarez/Vidal 1996: 5).

The question about ideological influence on translation has always accompanied translation studies. Fawcett (1998: 107) reminds us how "through the centuries, individuals and institutions have applied their particular beliefs to the production of certain effects in translations". He claims that "an ideological approach to translation can be found in some of the earliest examples of translation known to us" (1998: 6). In an article included in the

Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies, he explores a short history of ideology and translation, starting with the Middle Ages.

Unfortunately, under the influence of Marx's primary definition of ideology as a system of rules and values enforced upon the lower levels of society by the ruling class, ideology has gained a negative connotation. It will be further assumed that ideology is often defined in a purely negative political sense as "a system of wrong, false, distorted or otherwise misguided beliefs" (van Dijk, qtd in Calzada-Perez 2003: 3). In its more constructive sense, Marxists like Lenin define Socialist ideology as "a force that encourages revolutionary consciousness and fosters progress" (Calzada-Perez, 2003: 4). According to Calzada-Perez, recent definitions of ideology are also associated with the concepts of power relations and domination. She quotes from Eagleton, who rejects the frequent suggestion that the term 'ideology' has become more trouble than it is worth and offers the following as a definition: "ideas and beliefs which help to legitimate the interests of a ruling group or class specifically by distortion and dissimulation". As an alternative he suggests "false or deceptive beliefs" that arise "not from the interests of a dominant class but from the material structure of society as a whole" (Eagleton 1991: 30).

This view, in fact, forms the basis of post-colonial thinking which "highlights the power relations which inform contemporary cultural exchanges" (Simon 1996: 136). However, Calzada-Perez (2003: 5) argues that sometimes ideology is viewed in a more positive sense "as a vehicle to promote or legitimate interests of a particular social group (rather than a means to destroy contenders)".

In order to be politically correct, most scholars in the field of language-related, cultural and translation studies intend to avoid the binary division of ideology into "extremely negative" or "somehow positive" political phenomena and instead extend the concept of ideology beyond the political sphere, defining it in a social sense as "a set of ideas, which organize our lives and help us understand the relation to our environment" (Calzada-Perez 2003: 5). There is also a socio-political definition of ideology which was proposed by scholars of Critical Discourse Analysis, including van Dijk (1996: 7), who defines ideology as a framework that is "assumed to specifically organize and monitor one form of socially shared mental representation, in other words, the organized evaluative beliefs – traditionally called 'attitudes' – shared by social groups".

Talking about ideological aspects of translations, Christina Schäffner notices that,

> Ideological aspects can /…/ be determined within a text itself, both at the lexical level (reflected, for example, in the deliberate choice or avoidance of a particular word /…/ and the grammatical level (for example, use of passive structures to avoid an expression of agency). Ideological aspects can be more or less obvious in texts, depending on the topic of a text, its genre and communicative purposes (2003: 23).

R. Alvarez and M. Vidal suggest that translation can become a form of control used by a "superior" culture to create an image of the original, particularly for those who have no access to the reality of the original (1996: 3–4). They call attention to the abuse of power that translation can give rise to because all translation implies manipulation, whether conscious or not, of the original.

If the translator transforms from an invisible medium to a main participant in the process of a text's creation, then he/she automatically interprets texts by setting them against their general knowledge (about other texts, statements, discourses, conventions etc.) which is necessarily shaped by their social position and thus ideological.

> Translators /…/ are those people who let their knowledge govern their behavior. And that knowledge is ideological. It is controlled by ideological norms. If you want to become a translator you must submit to the translator's submissive role, submit to being possessed by what ideological norms inform you (Calzada-Perez 2003: 7).

In order to explain the increasing interest of translation scholars in the ideological issues of translation, it is necessary to follow the modification of the whole concept of the "original" text related to the "original" author in poststructuralism, which emphasized the privilege of form over meaning and resulted in a radical reformation of the main models on which translation theory was founded. Thus, a text *translation* was reinterpreted in the sense of a text *production* and the translator was elevated to the target text's creator as well as the source text's interpreter. As S. Bassnett explains talking about post-modernist theories, "the vital role of the translator in the interpretive process has moved away from the old idea of the translator as a betrayer of the pure source text" (1996: 11).

The most specific problem in translation studies, which translation theorists have always confronted, is a contradictory acknowledgement that transla-

tions are not the same as their originals, do not have to be the same and, finally, can never be the same. Contrary to this revolutionary statement, most linguistic-oriented translation theories, despite different approaches, have mainly been occupied with the primary notion of different equivalent aspects (aesthetic, formal, dynamic, functional or cultural) and evaluated translations according to the equivalent degree. The only valid way of translating was supposed to be the production of a fluent, idiomatic and "transparent" target text, which would seem to reflect the foreign writer's intention and the essential meaning of the foreign text, and could therefore be mistaken for a product of the target culture. Types of equivalence were suggested in order to specify the relationships between the source text and the target text (Nida 1964, Koller 1979 and Newmark 1981). A "good" translation was supposed to give the appearance of not being a translation at all, but an "original". In the 1960s and 1970s, Eugene Nida constructed his theoretical system of domesticating translation with the key word "naturalization". He remarks:

> A translation of dynamic equivalence aims at complete naturalness of expression, and tries to relate the receptors to modes of behavior relevant within the context of his own culture; it does not insist that he understand the cultural patterns of the source-language context in order to comprehend the message (qtd. in Nord 2001: 5).

Nida introduces the concept of "functional isomorphs" which require that in a certain language system, a concept or a meaning may be expressed in a form *A* in one language system and form *B* in another, but still have the same function.

Translation was merely viewed as a process of language transfer and a number of specialists adopted theories of linguistics to analyze and direct the activity of translation. Source-oriented approaches primarily stressed the authority of the author and fidelity to the source-text. Under their guidance, the translator was reduced to being invisible and his subjectivity was totally ignored. Linguistic theories still tend to view translation more as a science and not so much as an artful process of creation. This limited comprehension of the translation process required translation scholars to look at translation from another perspective. As Vermeer states:

> Linguistics alone won't help us. First, because translating is not merely and not even primarily a linguistic process. Secondly, because linguistics has not yet formulated the right questions to tackle our problems (qtd. in Nord 2001: 10).

Contrary to this equivalent- and source text-oriented approach, poststructuralist theory did not consider translation as a pure reproduction of an exact meaning but as the creation of an independent text with its own "soul", which came into existence in the reciprocal process of modifying, deferring and displacing the original. Similarly, poststructuralism allowed translators much more initiative and interpretation abilities than the linguistic-oriented approach which resulted in proclaiming the translator an invisible medium between the original text and the translation.

In the 1990s, Lawrence Venuti, an Italian visiting scholar, presented his opinion for foreignization. According to Venuti, probably the most widely discussed and cited translation scholar in the last few years (especially Venuti 1995), who advocates *foreignizing* (as against *domesticating*) translation at all costs,

> Poststructuralism has in fact initiated a radical reconsideration of the traditional topoi of translation theory. Largely through commentaries on Walter Benjamin's essay 'The Task of the Translator,' poststructuralist thinkers like Jacques Derrida and Paul de Man explode the "binary opposition between 'original' and 'translation' which underwrites the translator's invisibility today (Venuti 1992a: 6).

Venuti placed his emphasis on existing models of translation theory based on the glorification of the original which contributed to the invisibility of the translator (1992: 4). His main aim was to provoke "a rethinking of translation that is philosophical but also political, engaged in questions of language, discourse, and subjectivity, while articulating their relations to cultural difference, ideological contradiction, and social conflict" (1992: 6). In advocating "foreignized" translation, Venuti aims to make visible the "otherness" of the source text in translation culture, often by foregrounding the foreign linguistic form.

This approach was strongly influenced by poststructuralist translation theory, which challenged the assumption prevalent in Anglo-American culture about the translator's "invisibility". The core problem of the debate about the translator's role and the status of translation is situated in the linguistic question raised by French structuralist Ferdinand de Saussure's *Course in General Linguistics* (1916) about the definition of language in terms of a "signifier" (a sound or sound-image) and a "signified" (the form or concept represented by the signifier) which exist in a conventional relation, described as a substitute for the relation between word and meaning. Considering various aspects of meaning, the signified is always something

of an interpretation that is added to the signifier. Structuralism argues that any piece of writing, or any signifying system, has no origin, and that authors merely inhabit pre-existing structures (*langue*) that enable them to make any particular sentence (or story) – any *parole*. It follows that the independent position of the text as a changeable, interpretable structure appears to be highly questionable in structuralist interpretation. Actually, the individuality of the text disappears in favor of looking at patterns, systems and structures. Some structuralists, as well as a related school of critics, the Russian Formalists, believe that all narratives can be charted as variations on certain basic universal narrative patterns and represent sums of strongly defined poetic devices. In this way of looking at narratives, the author is not important, since he has simply inhabited the established structure and the text is produced by a system, not by an individual. The author just recombines some elements taken from a pre-existing structure. The main idea of structuralism may be summarized as the following – "language speaks us, rather than that we speak language". Structuralists also ignored such elements of the translation process as a text's production or reception/consumption, but were interested only in the structures that shaped it.

This is the moment when poststructuralism, or deconstruction, appeared. The first critic who claimed that the author could not be presented as the one and only creator of the text was Roland Barthes, who proclaimed that, "the text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centers of culture" (qtd. in Richter 1994: 224). In the framework of this assumption, it was no longer acceptable to consider the text as a product of authorial intentional and original use of pre-existing structures, or to refer the source of meaning and authority of a text back to its author (as the creator of that text), because "text is never original" (1994: 224). In Barthes' conception, the reader (and the translator is also a reader) becomes the one who creates the text in the process of reading, and the question of the author as 'God' of the text dissolves. Texts should be interpreted not in terms of their author's intentions, but only in a reciprocal relationship with other texts and discourses. A whole new method of interpreting texts was developed in the framework of the theory of intertextuality. Deconstruction, one of the main approaches of poststructuralism, does not offer a specific 'translation theory' of its own[2], but may be considered as a useful tool[3]

[2] Jacques Derrida is not a theorist of translation but rather a philosopher interested in language and translation.

[3] Many theorists have criticised deconstruction in translation studies as a rather reckless and pointless activity that implies "bottomless chessboards and random, accidental

because it deepens and broadens the conceptual meaning of the discourse and undermines its hierarchical oppositions. Deconstructivists, such as Jacques Derrida, interpret translation in the sense of challenging the limits of language, writing and reading, and moved away from the old idea of the translator as an invisible medium or a betrayer of the pure source text. They also suggest that it is in the process of translating texts where one comes as close as is possible to "difference" (Derrida qtd. in Graham 1985: 150). The act of 'deconstructing' or interpreting a text eschewed the concept of one possible meaning for a text, and instead suggested that meanings of a text are multiple and contradictory. It is not seen as recovering some deeper 'given' objective meaning which controls and unifies the text's structure, but as exposing the infinite possibilities, the most unusual interpretations, the 'free play' of meanings. According to Derrida, there is no absolute meaning of a text and translation ensures the continuity of the source text and guarantees its survival by bringing it to life in a new world of readers in a different language (qtd. in Bassnett 1981: 20).

Thus, both writing and translation are seen as "the endless displacement of meaning which both governs language and places it for ever beyond the reach of a stable, self-authenticating knowledge" (Norris 1982: 29). Consequently, translation began to be recognized as a form of "transformation": a regulated transformation of one language by another, of one text by another (Derrida 1987: 20).

The question of the increasing role of the translator arises along with a question about the status of the source text's originality. According to Venuti, poststructuralist thinkers believe that the original is itself a translation, an incomplete process of translating a signifying chain into univocal signified, and this process is both displayed and further complicated when it is translated by another signifying chain in a different language (1992: 7). In the poststructuralist conception, neither the foreign text nor the translation may be interpreted as an original semantic unit, considering the fact that both are presented as open fields of diverse linguistic and cultural materials and not as a concluded entity, as in structuralism. As a result, the roles of the author and the translator are rebalanced; neither of them is enabled to produce ultimate determination of the meaning, which is constructed through different signifiers. Translation does not occur as simple correspondence of meaning owing to differential plurality in every

development, without an end", as "play without calculation, wandering without an end or telos" (Gentzler 1993: 159, 167).

text. Thus the term "difference" in translation, traditionally a negative term signifying distortion, or deviation, is seen in a new light under the influence of deconstruction. Poststructuralist conceptions of meaning have directed attention away from the authority of the author towards the role of the reader as well as undermined the notion of the 'original' as a stable, untransferable entity. Automatically, the translator was transformed from an invisible mediator to an autonomous independent text producer who was able to create his/her own 'original'. Turning their backs on the source text, postmodern critics viewed the translator as a text designer.

As a result, the whole concept of 'equivalence', which served as one of the lines of division between the two main schools of thought in translation study, was replaced with such concepts as 'function', 'purpose' and 'cultural issues' which incorporated the translation in a more extensive social, political and cultural field. The linguistic-oriented principle which emphasizes the approach of equivalence as absolutely crucial has been challenged. Crawford, a scientist who along with Nida and members of the Leipzig school is often considered representative of the scientific approach, states that:

> The central problem of translation practice is that of finding TL translation equivalents. A central task of translation theory is that of defining the nature and conditions of translation equivalence (Crawford 1960: 21).

The linguistically oriented approach was criticized by scholars in the field of translation studies who took into consideration the significance of the situation, or more precisely, the culture in which translations were to be positioned. In general, scholars who work within this approach are less interested in the relation of equivalence between a target text and a source text and more concerned with the target culture, the function of a target text in new cultural surroundings, and the relevance of cultural features for translation. For Snell-Hornby the explication of equivalence is seen as an "unfruitful enterprise" (1988, 1990). Furthermore, many of these scholars are much more interested not in the 'sameness' of the target and source texts, but in the difference as well as in the mechanisms of textual manipulation. Target-oriented translation is justified by Toury in his *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (1995). Toury provides an assumption that it is features of the target culture and their potential power to influence the translation which become the main object of study (Toury 1995: 24–25).

It should be noted that with the increasing attention paid to the personality of the translator as well as to cultural factors in translation, the main translation strategies, namely, foreignization, which is oriented towards the source culture, and domestication, which is oriented towards the target culture, have given rise to much controversy in recent years. There are advocates and opponents to each of the two strategies both at home and abroad. In the international translation forum, some translators still favor Eugene Nida's "closest natural correspondence" and his famous remark that "a good translation is not like a translation at all" (domestication) (1964: 159–160). On the other hand, followers of Venuti advocate foreignizing translation from the post-colonial perspective which contributed to the progress of colonization and consider foreignization as an instrument of resistance against cultural hegemony.

One of the most radical modern translation theories is called *functionalism* and illustrates a major shift from 'linguistic equivalence' to 'functional appropriateness'. Functionalist approaches contradict the classical translation statement that the basis for the evaluation of a good translation has always been the source text (ST), in other words, an accurate reproduction of the source text's message. This is the main criteria within the linguistic model of translation (Neubert/Shreve 1992: 19) which emphasizes those criteria of the target text which contribute to an accurate, correct and faithful reproduction of the source text. Functionalists such as Christina Schäffner try to undermine the source text itself by emphasizing the role of the translator as the creator of a target text, giving priority to the purpose (*skopos*) of producing the target text and focusing not on the translation of "grammatical structure, but texts as communicative occurrences" (Schäffner 1997: 1). The text is analyzed as a communicative discourse which has to fulfill a specific function in a new cultural environment. According to Schäffner, "a good translation is then rather a target text which effectively fulfils its intended role in the target culture" (1997: 2). The German functionalist, Hönig, claims that both the translator and the target text's users are assigned a higher status and a more influential role than in the case of more traditional approaches to translation (qtd. in Schäffner 1997: 3). He also argues for a self-confident translator who knows for whom he/she translates and what the users want to do with the text.

Generally, functionalism redirected attention away from linguistic approaches towards the role of context in the translation process itself, allowing the translator to make decisions based on the contextual factors surrounding the target text (purpose, audience, time etc). Sonia Colina

states that "functionalism is a contextually based theory of translation that allows for consideration of contextual factors intervening in the translation process, even if [these factors are] contradictory in nature" (2003: 13). Thus, the function of the source text, the intended functions of the target text and the features necessary to appropriately express that function in the target text are shown as the main guiding principles in the translation process. According to Schäffner, the functionalist approach is a kind of "cover term" for the research of scholars who argue that the purpose of the target text is the most important criterion in any translation (1996: 2). From the perspective of functional approaches to translation (particularly under the influence of Holz-Mänttäri's theory of 'translational action'), translation is viewed as a communicative act. In this view, translation is conceived primarily "as a process of intercultural communication, whose end product is a text which is capable of functioning appropriately in specific situations and context of use" (Schäffner 1998a: 3).

A similar focus on the features of the target system, more specifically on the goal/purpose/intention of the translation in their immediate environment, the target literature, defined as its scopos, underlines another dominant theoretical contribution to translation studies, i.e. scopos theory (Vermeer 1978, 1983, 1986 and Reiss/Vermeer 1984). The *skopos* of a translation, Vermeer explains, is defined by the commission, "the instruction, given by oneself or by someone else, to carry out a given action [which could be a translation]" (2000: 229) and if necessary adjusted by the translator. From this point of view, translation is considered not as a process of reproduction (the position usually adopted by earlier non-functionalist approaches), but as a form of human action which has its own purpose basically decided on by the translator (Schäffner 1998b: 235; Hönig 1998: 9). The Skopos theory holds that the strategy a translator adopts, whether domestication or foreignization, depends on the function a translation is expected to serve. Released from his/her commitment to reproduce the source text, the translator is a text producer who creates a new text on the basis of the communicative factors of reception in each situation. He/she must interpret source text information "by selecting those features which most closely correspond to the requirements of the target situation" (Shuttleworth & Cowie 1997: 156). Departing from tradition, the functional approach presumes that guided by loyalty to the *skopos*, the translator is free to produce a new text that differs considerably from the source text in both form and substance and is determined by the target recipient's requirements (which are, however, discerned and decided on by the translator himself/herself).

The translation then is "the production of a functionally appropriate target text based on an existing source text [or what Neubert calls 'source-text induced target-text production'], and the relationship between the two texts is specified according to the *skopos* of the translation" (Schäffner 1998b: 236). Skopos theory has modernized translation theory by emphasizing the role of the translator as an expert in translational action and regarding the source text as an offer of information whose role in the action is to be decided by the translator, depending on the expectations and needs of the target readers (Hönig 1998: 9). In essence, *Skopos* theory and functionalism focus on the translator, giving him/her more freedom and at the same time more responsibility. The translator thus becomes a target-text author freed from the "limitations and restrictions imposed by a narrowly defined concept of loyalty to the source text alone" (Schäffner 1998b: 238).

> [The translator] may be held responsible for the result of his/her translational acts by recipients and clients. In order to act responsibly, however, translators must be allowed the freedom to decide in co-operation with their clients what is in their best interests (Hönig 1998: 10).

Hönig (1998: 14) introduces the characteristics of functional approaches as follows: the translator must be visible and loyal to his client; the translation process should be target-text oriented; the aims of translations are communicative acceptability; translation tools are taken from psycho- and sociolinguistics; the analogy for the functional approach is the bridge. The visibility and responsibility of the translator are key concepts in functional approaches. The question of the translator's responsibility is one of the essentials in the functionalist approach, as Toury declares, "It is always the translator herself or himself, as an autonomous individual, who decides how to behave, be that decision fully conscious or not. Whatever the degree of awareness, it is s/he who will also have to bear the consequences" (2000: 19).

It should be noted that strictly linguistics-oriented approaches in translation studies cannot be considered as sufficiently appropriate for the successful interpretation of ideological concepts. Normally, such approaches are defined as "mainly descriptive studies focusing on textual forms" (Calzada-Perez 2003: 8) and are limited to scientific research into the textual structure which is somehow isolated from other contexts. Thus, linguistics-oriented approaches remain "reluctant to take into account the social values [and ideologies] that enter into translating as well as the study of it" (Venuti 1998a: 1). A new cross-disciplinary method which studies the structures

of different aspects of language, including translation, and considers both their linguistic and socio-cultural dimensions in order to determine how meaning is constructed, is called *Critical Discourse Analysis* (CDA). The ideological dimension is one of the fundamentals in Critical Discourse Analysis which exposes "the ideological forces that underlie communicative exchanges [like translating]" (Calzada-Perez 2003: 2) and provides the assumption that ideologies are largely acquired and changed through discourse and the social-cognitive nature of ideologies as forms of social cognitions shared by social groups. CDA advocates that all language use, including translation, should be interpreted under the influence of different ideologies, which means that translation is always a site for ideological encounters. Similarly, Christina Schäffner (2003: 23) claims that all translations are ideological since "the choice of a source text and the use to which the subsequent target text is put are determined by the interests, aims, and objectives of social agents". She evidently opts of van Dijk's definition of ideology as "basic systems of shared social representations that may control more specific group beliefs" (van Dijk 1996: 7).

Stemming from Habermas's (1973) critical theory, CDA's main aim is to identify methods and criteria for an adequate analysis of different discourses that are mediated by mainstream ideologies and power relationships. The key figures in this area include Fairclough (1992, 1993, 1998, 2000, 2001, 2003), van Dijk (1993, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2003.), Gee (1999, 2005), Huckin (1997) and Wodak (1996, 2000, 2001).

As Fairclough (2001: 16) argues, in CDA, the analyst should be concerned not only with texts themselves but also with the processes of producing and interpreting those texts, and with how these cognitive processes are socially shaped and historically changed. Each discourse is produced within a context and cannot be understood without taking into consideration the historical, sociopolitical and linguistic perspectives (Wodak's discourse-historical model).

As practice shows, CDA does not have a unitary theoretical framework or methodology; instead it is best viewed as a shared perspective encompassing a range of approaches instead of one school. Nonetheless, it provides some basic issues. Generally speaking, CDA regards discourse as "a form of social practice" (Fairclough/Wodak 1997: 258) and helps to clarify the connections between the use of language and the exercise of power. In fact, it considers language not as an independent structure, but as a construct which exists in a particular historical, social, and political scheme and is

defined by immediate social, political, and historical conditions. In CDA's view, language also represents a system of linguistic terms, which themselves realize discursive and ideological systems. As for texts in particular, they are selected and organized syntactic forms whose 'content-structure' reflects the ideological organization of a particular area of social life. Leading authorities, such as politicians, courts, government and editors play a crucial role in shaping issues and in setting the boundaries of legitimate discourse (Henry & Tator 2002). CDA focuses on how social relations, identity, knowledge, and power are constructed through written and spoken texts in communities, schools, the media, and the political arena (Luke 1997).

Being a form of social practice, CDA addresses social problems and gives special consideration to studying and analyzing different discourses in order to reveal the hidden sources of power, dominance and inequality, and to explore the way in which these dominant sources are initiated, maintained, reproduced, and transformed within specific social, economic, political, and historical contexts (van Dijk 1988). By explaining how social relations of power are exercised and negotiated in and through discourses (Fairclough/Wodak 1997), CDA scholars aim to support the victims of such oppression and encourage them to resist and transform their lives (Foucault 2000). Uncovering the ideological assumptions that are hidden in the discourses in order to resist and overcome various forms of 'power over' is considered one of the main aims of CDA (Fairclough 1989) which is also connected to the past and the current context.

According to Fairclough (2000), discourse is shaped and constrained by (a) social structure (class, status, age, ethnic identity, and gender) and (b) culture. Furthermore, CDA tries to unite, and determine the relationship between, three levels of analysis: (a) the actual text; (b) the discursive practices (that is the process involved in creating, writing, speaking, reading, and hearing); and (c) the larger social context that bears upon the text and the discursive practices (Fairclough 2000). CDA links the text (micro level) with the underlying power structures in society (macro sociocultural practice level) through discursive practices upon which the text was drawn (meta-level) (Thompson 2002).

In regard to discourse analysis, CDA provides different options regardless of text type and function. While it can focus on body language, utterances, symbols, visual images, and other forms of semiotics (signs and symbols) as means of discourse (Fairclough 2002), it can also analyze written language. The most notable work has been done by Fairclough (1992, 2000,

2001, 2003), Huckin (1997) and van Dijk (1993, 1997, 2001). Though they vary considerably in technical specification, they share a common strategy. According to Luke:

> CDA involves a principled and transparent shunting back and forth between the microanalysis of texts using varied tools of linguistics, semiotic, and literary analysis and the microanalysis of social formations, institutions, and power relations that these texts index and construct (Luke 2002: 100).

Consequently, attempts to systematize CDA draw from theories and models of text analysis on one hand, and from contemporary political and socio cultural theories on the other.

Van Dijk's ideological analysis of discourse

In contrast to strictly linguistically oriented analyses which included detailed textual analysis (Fairclough 1992, 2001 and Wodak 1996), van Dijk developed a socio-cognitive analysis of discourse oriented both to lexico-syntatic features of texts and to cultural and social resources and contexts which are even more important. Whereas social analysis in this model pertains to examining the "overall societal structures" (the non-linguistic context), discourse analysis is primarily text-based. However, what makes van Dijk's approach unique is his cognitive analysis. Van Dijk asserts (1998: 126) that in order to explain the proper nature of ideologies and their relation to social practices and discourse, we first need a revealing insight into their mental or cognitive dimension. The main point here is that ideologies indirectly influence the personal cognition of group members in the act of comprehension and production of discourse.

Van Dijk's approach is based on four categories: action, context, power and ideology. Van Dijk refers ideologies to social norms and values, "ideologies organize social group attitudes consisting of schematically organized general options about relevant social issues" (2000: 138). His analysis of lexical ideological structures in discourse is based on the division into *positive self-presentation* and *negative other-presentation*. Van Dijk states that the ideological semantics underlying each lexical selection follows a "rather clear strategic pattern" which means that in general in-groups and

their members, friends and supporters tend to be described in positive terms. In contrast, out-groups, enemies or opponents are usually described in negative terms (2000: 143). On the basis of this categorization, van Dijk lists structures and strategies of text and talk which are typically ideologically relevant, depending on topic, context, speech act and communicative goals, for in-groups and out-groups. Thus, among strategies describing positive action are: emphasis, assertion, hyperbole, detailed description, high, prominent position; headlining, summarizing; narrative illustration, topicalization; attribution to personality; explicit; direct; argumentative support and impression management. Strategies describing negative action are divided into: de-emphasis; denial; understatement; de-topicalization; low, non-prominent position; marginalization; vague, overall description; attribution to context; implicit; indirect; no storytelling; no argumentative support and no impression management.

It is clear that only some of these strategies may be applied to the analysis of poetry. Thus, the most common strategies of describing positive action in poetry are emphasis, positive hyperbole and assertion, while strategies describing negative actions include de-emphasis, denial, de-topicalization, generalization, marginalization and understatement. To these strategies may be added the strategy of softening, which was often used by Soviet translators of Burns.

Van Dijk's approach differs from linguistics in that it is not limited exclusively to the study of the text structures. Once such a structural analysis has been made, according to van Dijk's method, it is possible to proceed to establishing relationships with the context. Van Dijk essentially perceives discourse analysis as the analysis of ideology, and argues throughout his works (1995, 1998) that one of the crucial social practices influenced by ideologies is discourse, which, in turn, influences how we acquire, learn, take on, change and reproduce ideologies. Thus, by analysing the discursive dimensions of ideologies in texts, we can prove how they can affect society and its members and at the same time how they may also be reproduced or legitimised or challenged in society.

Van Dijk is interested in the actual processes of decoding, interpretation, storage, representation in memory, and in the role of previous knowledge and beliefs of the readers in this process of understanding. Ideology plays an important role in van Dijk's analytical method, as it is viewed as an interpretive framework which organizes sets of attitudes about other elements of modern society. Ideologies, therefore, provide the "cognitive foundation"

for the attitudes of various groups in societies, as well as the furtherance of their own goals and interests. Therefore, in contrast with many Marxist or other critics who interpret the role of the media in modern societies deterministically, van Dijk does not suggest that ideologies are 'false' forms of consciousness, as in the case of many traditional theories of ideology. Still, the possible discrepancy between group ideology and group interests implies that power relations in society can also be reproduced and legitimated at the ideological level, meaning that, to control other people, it is most effective to try to control their group attitudes and especially their even more fundamental, attitude-producing, ideologies. In such circumstances, audiences will behave of their own 'free' will in accordance with the interests of the powerful.

As van Dijk explains in his article *Ideological Discourse Analysis*, "ideologies of speakers or writers may be "uncovered" by close reading, understanding or systematic analysis, if language users explicitly or unwittingly "express" their ideologies through language and communication" (2000: 135). He emphasizes that we may therefore predict the ideological discourse which will be semantically oriented towards the following functions:

1. self-identity description, typical of those groups whose identity is threatened or marginalized;
2. activity-description, typical of groups who are defined by their professional activities;
3. goal-description;
4. norm and value description;
5. position and relation description;
6. resource description

The combination of both linguistic and functional methods presented in van Dijk's research enables the extensive analysis of ideological content in translations. Thus, this categorization will be used for defining certain functions which different translators of Robert Burns's poetry intended to achieve in order to satisfy the meanings and goals of their social group. In the case of the Soviet Union, this task will be 'simplified' because all translators' intentions were unified and aimed to satisfy the ideology of one single group, the communist authorities. According to Blyum, the Soviet state gradually came to be dominated not so much by an ideocracy as by a logocracy – the power of words. Towards the end of the regime few people had any concern for the purity of the moribund ideology: what

mattered was to write and say the necessary words, to maintain some kind of ideological decorum. The main function of ideological censorship was to create a phantom, an unreal world, the product, on the one hand, of hallucinations (when a man sees what is not there in reality), and, on the other hand, so-called negative hallucinations (when a man is so brainwashed by propaganda that he fails to see or be aware of reality) (2003: 10).

Additional strategies useful for the ideological analysis of a poetic translation were developed by Delabastita (1993: 33–34) and include *substitution*, *deletion*/*omission* and *addition*. Substitution, the most common translation strategy, is the only strategy which occurs in strict recoding processes; i.e. translation in its strictest sense falls into this category, whereas the other three types of relations appear to be characteristic of recoding in the wider sense of the word, when one is speaking of transformation and adaptation. Substitution implies that the relevant source text is replaced by the relevant target text item. Using deletion/omission as a translation strategy means that the source text item is not rendered in the target text at all. This is a frequent phenomenon in actual translation practice and often cannot be avoided (e.g. metaphor into non-metaphor) (Delabastita 1993: 35). The opposite process to deletion is that of addition when the target text turns out to contain linguistic, cultural or textual component features which have no apparent antecedent in the source text (Delabastita 1993: 36). Additions may also be due to conscious, intentional interventions by the translator, and therefore could be considered to be the most important strategy in creating 'difference'.

Summarizing the main outlines of this chapter, it is clear that my research requires the combination of two methods. The linguistic method enables me to analyze the structure of poetic translations and to find out which strategies were used by translators to incorporate ideological connotations into the poetic structures. On the other hand, Critical Discourse Analysis, presented as one type of socio-political analysis of discourse, which requires the analysis of cultural, political and sociological issues, makes it possible to summarize the dominant ideological functions fulfilled by literary translations and to define the role of ideological translation in culture and society.

Wodak's historical model, which emphasises the inclusion of historical perspective as "social processes are dynamic, not static" (Wodak 1989: xvi), is also highly suitable as the analysis of Burns translations covers two different periods in Russian history.

Chapter Three

The History of Censorship

When talking about censorship, a number of contemporary Russian critics still deal with the topic of power abuse; however, some of them have avoided the purely negative connotations associated with the term. Thus, for instance, Mikhail Konashev's research into the introduction of political censorship and the transformation of the library system through the invention of special collections, *spetskhran* (1995), as well as his analysis of the history of censorship in Russia (1995) are characterized by the tendency to recreate, mainly theoretically at least, the legitimacy of censorship. Konashev states that the debates about contemporary comprehension of the term 'censorship' demonstrate above all two opposite understandings of the phenomena of censorship: a narrow one and a broad one.

The 'narrow' concept of censorship is followed strongly by many researchers including Arlen Blyum, who defines censorship as "one of the most important mechanisms for the defense of an ideological and political system" (2003: 1), which enables the optimal functioning of the system as a whole. According to Blyum, two kinds of censorship can be spoken about: the first is official (governmental) or state censorship; the second is social censorship (censorship of society). Blyum even suggests that a certain form of censorship has existed and still exists in all societies; the difference is in the nature and intensity of its operation. In the case of state censorship, we are concerned with administrative censorship which functions as a legal mechanism and an institution of government. In other cases, we are concerned with schools of thought, critical attitudes and the press ("quasi-legal regulations"), which assign a text a particular status and "reputation", causing it either to be accepted or rejected by public opinion (2003: 1–2).

To understand the role and meaning of censorship's influence, it is necessary to avoid the negative impression that is attached to the word at first utterance. The term censorship is much more complex, and its meaning

cannot be restricted to the oppressive practices of totalitarian governments. The other critical point of view is broader and signifies that censorship can be defined as any limitation of information practiced by any social group, or even by an individual. According to Michaela Wolf, the broader meaning of censorship can be seen in all forms of societal organization, and there can be no total presence and no total absence of the phenomenon. (2002: 45). According to this broad point of view, censorship has always existed and will exist forever in any advanced society in some form or other. Exploring possible causes of censorship of the written word[4], the primary target of censorship since ancient Rome and Greece, we can distinguish between two primary backgrounds for censorship in the history of mankind: morality and religion. Censorship is often based on obscenity laws, and religious censorship is close to censorship on moral grounds.

Another reason, particularly important for this research of ideological adaptation of Robert Burns's poetry, is political. Censorship is often based on reasons of power and in most cases is used by governments to force the public to read what is prescribed for it, cutting people off from any other sources of information outside state control. This method of keeping a group of people, or the whole nation, ignorant by isolating them from the outside world, has historically been the most successful way of maintaining totalitarian government.

According to Michaela Wolf, metaphorically, censorship can be defined as the defender and guardian of tradition, delimiting not only the Other, but also "acting to immunize against any sort of change". In this context, censorship stabilizes and regulates tradition, but tradition by its very nature has a particularly variable character. Consequently, Wolf distinguishes between two main classifications of censorship: preventive censorship which "shifts the pressure to adapt from the public to the inner life of the individual, thereby helping individuals to internalize censorship" – to this classification also belongs self-censorship – and explicit censorship, which "presupposes a certain irreducible degree of conscience and intentionality" (2002: 46).

Among contemporary Russian critics who defend the meaning and purposes of censorship is M. M. Kovaleva, who states that the subject of censorship and methods of its study have still not been fully clarified in literary or any other science. Kovaleva traces the term 'censorship' to 'qualification',

[4] In this chapter, I focus only on the censorship of literature.

declaring that any state system without the special institute of censorship is impossible. The researcher complained about a purely negative attitude to censorship and the restricted interpretation of this phenomenon when censorship is considered only as tyranny and repression of freedom of thought. Such a narrow interpretation of censorship provokes gloomy associations with the Middle Ages and the Inquisitions (1995: 23–24).

According to Kovaleva, the traditional classification of censorship prevents scientists from interpreting censorship as a social phenomenon. Therefore, she defines censorship not only as the system of political and juridical control of the production, the circulation and the use of information, but also as a phenomenon that expresses and formats the political and spiritual culture of society (1995: 9).

L. M. Makushin also supports a broad interpretation of censorship, according to which censorship is not restricted to the 'power-society' relationship, but is "the necessary element of administrative structure of society, the instrument of state power". Therefore, the state has to improve censorship, to transform it in accordance with historical conditions as well as the social and cultural situation (1996: 48).

V. A. Babintsev shares the same positive interpretation of censorship, stating that the term censorship will be considered negative until it is associated with its totalitarian distortion. His statement is radical in some way, as he comes to the conclusion that there was no censorship at all in Stalinist Russia because censorship is the notion of legal regulation, and Stalinist 'censorship' was an absolutely illegal phenomenon. He himself is against a broad interpretation of censorship when this term of legal sphere is used for analyzing phenomena from other spheres (1996: 86).

Summing up these statements, one can say that a broad conception of censorship brings us to the conclusion that the term 'censorship' should be deprived of the negative connotations associated with the restrictions that existed in totalitarian states. In the modern world, it should be considered as a natural and almost eternal phenomenon that exists in most societies and is a routine mechanism for the control and regulation of information.

Banned books: famous examples

Soviet censorship has remained the most enduring and the most extensive censorship in the twentieth century. However, Soviet critics did not invent this term. It has existed since ancient times, even though it became industrialized only after the invention of printing, which established certain means and facilitated methods of control. The form of control depends on the particular society; in some it was reduced to a minimum, while in others it influenced all aspects of social and cultural life.

The office of *censors* was first established in Rome in 443 BC. Originally, censorship was not regarded as a purely restricting action. The duty of the censor was to collect statistics and patrol their accuracy. Probably the most famous case of censorship in ancient times is that of Socrates, who was sentenced to drink poison in 399 BC for his corruption of youth and acknowledgement of unorthodox divinities.

In the 'cradle of democracy', Athens, censorship was considered a useful instrument for enforcing the prevailing orthodoxy. It was Plato who first formulated rational explanations and justifications for the intellectual, religious, and artistic censorship in his utopian work *The Republic*. In the ideal city outlined in this philosophical treatise, official censors would prohibit mothers and nurses from relating tales that were supposed to be bad or evil. Plato also suggested treating any heretical notions about God as official crimes and to establish formal procedures for suppressing heresy.

The commencement of official censorship of public speech goes back to ancient Rome. Ovid was banished from Rome after publishing the *Ars Amatoria* (The Art of Love). He died in exile in Greece eight years later[5].

In the history of Western culture, the Orthodox Church became the first official censor in the most negative and restricting sense of this word. The church mercilessly pursued and persecuted attempts to contradict its basic doctrines and interfered in all aspects of social and political life, consolidating its enormous influence. According to Aurelie Hagstrom, the most important dimension of the Church's attempt to protect and preserve the faith was the practice of censoring materials and ideas from outside the life

[5] All Ovid's works were burned by Savonarola in Florence in 1497, and an English translation of *Ars Amatoria* was banned by U.S. Customs in 1928.

of the Church, as it made judgments on ideas, philosophies and books that were contrary to Christian faith and morals. This sort of censorship was directed outward to the world (2003: 149).

The position of orthodox censorship was invigorated by the formation of the Sacred Inquisition[6] (1235), established by Pope Gregory IX to patrol and enforce the orthodoxy of the Christian faith. Among the most famous authors banned and persecuted by the Inquisition are Galileo Galilei, forced to spend the rest of his life under house arrest; Nicolaus Copernicus, whose books remained forbidden until 1829; Giordano Bruno (1600) and Lucilio Vanini (1619), both burned along with their works.

In the middle of the fifteenth century, the problem of controlling heretical ideas increased with the invention of the printing press, which enabled the rapid dissemination of various materials. The printed book became an instrument of 'heretics', such as the leader of Protestantism Martin Luther, who translated the Bible into vernacular German (1534), in a battle with official orthodox doctrine. As more books were written, copied and increasingly widely disseminated, subversive and heretical ideas spread beyond control.

The quick spread of printed papers opened a new chapter in the history of Western censorship, when in 1559, Pope Paul IV proclaimed the first Roman *Index Librorum Prohibiturum* (Index of Forbidden Books) which was very similar to previous indexes of the same nature. However, this was the first universal one and included books which expressed ideas contrary to Catholic morals and teachings; it was also administered by the Roman Inquisition (Bald 1999: 169) and became the most famous instrument of Church censorship. The index was the first official list of books forbidden to be read or even owned without special permission because of their heretical content. Heneghan calls it "the most ambitious censorship drive the world has ever known" (2002: 22). The list included all Bibles authorized by Martin Luther, all unauthorized vernacular Bibles but the Latin, the Talmud and the Koran, *De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium* by Copernicus (1543), the *Dialoga* of Galilei (1632), works of Plato, Cicero, Virgil, Homer, Aristotle, and many other ideologically 'dangerous' works. The lists were issued twenty times through the centuries by different popes, the last as recently as 1948, and finally suppressed by Pope Paul VI in 1966. According to Margaret Bald, in the 42nd and final Index issued in 1948 and in print

[6] The most famous victims of the Inquisitions trials are Joan of Arc (1431) and Thomas More (1535).

until 1966, a of total of 4,126 books were still prohibited to Catholics: 1,331 from the seventeenth century or earlier, 1,186 from the eighteenth century, 1,354 from the nineteenth and 255 from the twentieth century (1999: 170).

Later the list included Rabelais (complete works), Pascal's *Pensees* (1670), Voltaire's *Lettres Philosophiques* (c. 1778); Casanova's *Memoirs*, published only in 1831; V. Hugo's *Notre Dame de Paris* (1831) and *Les Misérables* (1862), Zola (complete works), William's *The Bloody Tenant of Persecution* (1644); Servetus's *Christianity Restored* (1552); Tyndale's *The New Testament* (1526); Luther's *Ninety-five Theses* (1517); Bruno's *On the Infinite Universe and Worlds* (1584); Darwin's *On the Origin of Species*; Stendhal's *The Red and the Black*[7] (1831); Kant's *Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone* (1793); Goethe's *The Sorrows of Young Werther* (1774) and Dickens's *Oliver Twist* (1838)[8] (Karolides/Bald/Sova 1999: 169–264).

As a result of these rigorous arrangements, the Catholic Church successfully controlled the expansion of pure orthodox doctrines and retarded progressive thought and ideas. No book could be printed or sold without permission of the church. Censorship created through the close alliance between church and state in Catholic countries was also exported to the forcibly colonized countries in the Americas. In order to protect America from the Protestant ideas which represented a permanent threat to the Catholic Church, the Inquisition was first established in 1569 in Peru, as a part of Philip II Spain's colonial policy. The Peruvian system of censorship entailed rigorous control on the import of books. Among other negative consequences, oppressive censorship had a devastating effect on the unique literature of the Maya people. The burning of the Maya Codex remains one of the worst criminal acts committed against a people and their cultural heritage.

The first official protest against government control was expressed by John Milton in his pamphlet essay *Areopagitica* (1644). Milton strongly criticized the powerful system of pre-censorship practiced in late Medieval Europe and appealed to Parliament to rescind their Licensing Order of June 16th, 1643. The Order was designed to bring publishing under government control by creating a number of official censors to whom authors would submit their work for approval prior to having it published. Milton reminded readers of God's will to give man reason and subsequently the

[7] The book was also banned in Russian by Nicholas I.

[8] *Oliver Twist* was censored because of the unpleasant image of Fagin, introduced with archetypal Anti-Semitic and Satanic characteristics.

right to choose and confirmed his arguments with the words of Euripides, which he chose for an epigraph. Milton's powerful defence of free expression contributed to the final collapse of the Licensing Act in Britain in 1694 and his *Areopagitica* became one of the most remarkable works concerning freedom of expression (Karolides/Bald/Sova 1999: 15–19).

The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were a time of reason and personal spiritual freedom. However, in 1667, a new magistracy, the General Lieutenant of Police, was created in Paris. The magistrate was in charge of security, supervision of customs and the censorship of books. The list of prohibited books published by the Catholic Church was also constantly renewed. In 1701, John Locke's philosophical *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* was expressly forbidden to be taught at Oxford University. The French translation was also placed on the Index. In 1759, the *Encyclopedie ou Dictionnaire Raisonne Des Sciences*, *Des Arts et de Metiers*, the project of a group of French intellectuals, including Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Denis Diderot and Francois Arout le Voltaire, was placed on the papal index.

Finally, the rights, liberty and dignity of an individual became subject to legislative protection. Sweden was the first country to abolish censorship and introduce a law guaranteeing freedom of the press in 1766, followed by Denmark and Norway which abolished official censorship in 1770. The most famous document guaranteeing an individual's freedom of speech as well as of the press was the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States (1787).

Many classical literary works and their authors were regarded as scandalous for various reasons when they were first published. Throughout the nineteenth century and into the early twentieth, books were forbidden mainly on the grounds of immorality, which often meant descriptions of sexual relationships, and of sacrilege. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the scandalous writer the Marquis de Sade became one of the most famous victims of censorship. He was arrested in 1801 by the French government, while his book *Justine*, *ou les Malheurs de la Vertu*, published in 1791, remained banned in France for religious reasons until the 1960s.

Many books were banned because they discussed or alluded to such familiar social phenomena as prostitution, unwed pregnancy and adultery, such as, Thomas Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* (1895) and Nathaniel Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter* (1850). Neither of these books can be categorized as erotic or pornographic, yet both were banned for their sexual content (Sova 1999: 265).

Surprisingly, the supposed liberty and freedom of speech in the United States did not prevent many writers from being banned, censored, shunned, and even, in the case of Henry Miller, refused admission to the States after being published abroad. Among the most famous examples of books banned for different reasons in the United States are Mark Twain's *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (1884), Theodore Dreiser's *Sister Carrie* (1900), John Steinbeck's *The Grapes of Wrath* (1939)[9], Richard Wright's *Native Son* (1940), Vladimir Nabokov's *Lolita* (1955) and Sylvia Plath's *The Bell Jar* (1963).

The whole field of books including the so-called 'proletarian' or collective novels that were critical of capitalism and American democracy were also considered dangerous. The list of forbidden proletarian literature included John Steinbeck's *In Dubious Battle* (1936); *The Grapes of Wrath* (1939), banned for use of the names 'God' and 'Jesus' in a vain and profane manner, along with inappropriate sexual references; and Karl Marx's and Friedrich Engel's *The Communist Manifesto.*

One of the most astonishing examples of censorship in the liberal United States concerns Mark Twain's novel *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, which in 1885 was banned on social grounds from the Concord Public Library with the comment that, "this trash is suitable only for the slums"[10]. According to G. Camfield (1991: 96–98), most objections centred around Twain's characterization of Jim as a negative stereotype that racists used to reinforce their prejudice and the author's extensive use of the term "nigger", the most powerful racial epithet in the English language, throughout the text. For that reason, in 1957, the book was dropped from a list of approved books for senior and junior high schools. The whole period of the novel's censorship extended from 1885 until 1986.

American moral censorship in the nineteenth century was stubborn. Among other novels banned in United States during that period of time was Nathaniel Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter* (1850), censored on sexual grounds and challenged under claims that it was pornographic, obscene and conflicted with the values of the community. A review in *Brownson's Quar-*

[9] Generally cited for 'vulgar language', John Steinbeck has been burned, banned and challenged since its publication. The first incident was the burning of his books by the St. Louis public library, and in the 1950s it was challenged as questionable material in California as reading material for an 11th grade literature class.

[10] It is interesting that in 1946 the book was published in the Soviet Union with a preface containing strong criticism of racism in the USA and immediately became a bestseller.

terly declared that neither Dimmesdale nor Hester exhibited "remorse" or "really repents of the criminal deed" and that "it is a story that should not have been told" (Karolides/Bald/Sova 1999: 402). The author was strongly criticized for making Hester Prynne, a sexually promiscuous woman, so sympathetic. Strict morality required that Hester suffer more, and in more painful ways that Hawthorne provided[11].

Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin*[12] (1852) was also banned in the Southern States for expounding an unpleasant picture of slavery. Admired throughout the English-speaking world, Stowe's novel was criticized in the States for being sentimental and limited in its focus on the lives of African-American slaves as well as for the use of the word "nigger"[13]. Published in 1857, Gustave Flaubert's most famous novel *Madame Bovary*, was banned in France on sexual grounds, but this time the novel even went on trial and the author himself was charged with insulting the public morality and offending decent manners. Flaubert was criticized for portraying French women as scandalous, promiscuous and immoral as well as for glorifying adultery[14] and disgracing marriage. Flaubert also described love scenes, or more precisely sexual encounters, between Emma and her lovers, accompanying them with a glorification of adultery and sexual desire. However, the biggest controversy was Emma's complete ignorance of her sins. As a result, Flaubert's attitude towards the position of a woman in society and her sexual behaviour were considered unacceptable and in need of censorship. The trial ended successfully for the novel on the grounds that there were only a few passages that actually questioned morality. It caused such a debate that the trial is considered "a milestone in the history of freedom of expression" (Rozen 1997: 9). Among other books banned for sexual content in different European countries are Dreiser's *American Tragedy* (1925), *The Arabian Nights*[15] (banned in 1881 in England), Ovid's *The Art of Love* (banned in 1926 in England) Voltaire's *Candide* (declared obscene

[11] In 1852, the novel was banned in Russia by Czar Nicholas I in a 'censorship terror', but the ban was lifted four years later by Czar Alexander II (Karolides/Bald/Sova 1999: 402).

[12] The book was also banned in Russia in the nineteenth century.

[13] 'Nigger' is probably one of the the most problematic terms in the English language. The world famous novel by Margaret Mitchell, *Gone with the Wind*, was also banned and criticized because of frequent use of this word.

[14] In fact, the novel was unofficially given a second title, *A History of the Adulteries of a Provincial Wife*.

[15] It was translated by Sir Richard Burton.

by U. S. Customs in 1929 and seized in 1930), Boccaccio's *Decameron*[16] (banned in 1921 in England) Defoe's *Moll Flanders* (1722) and many others (Karolides/Bald/Sova 1999: 265–332).

Among other famous authors of the time who were faced with censorship[17] and even exile because of censorship controversy around their works are Charles Baudelaire, the author of *Les Fleur du mal*, which is considered to be a predecessor of modern poetry but banned in 1857 for its romanticism, spirit of revolt, and its use of dreams, myths, and fantasies; Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* (1859), banned in various places for promoting evolutionary theory, and Walt Whitman's *Leaves of Grass* (1855), which was declared obscene from its first publication in which the poet was not ashamed to reveal his awareness of his own sexuality.

Among books which were banned at the beginning of the twentieth century are John Steinbeck's *Of Mice and Men* (1937), banned on social grounds and because of the language, and D. H. Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (1928), temporarily banned in the United States and the UK for its sexually explicit nature and for violation of obscenity laws. The novel was also banned in Ireland, Poland, Australia, Japan, Canada, and China. The ban was lifted in the US in 1960 and the book went on to sell over two million copies in its first year of publication. *Ulysses* (1918), one of the first modernist novels by James Joyce, was also banned on sexual grounds[18] for almost fifteen years. In 1918 chapters published in the *Little Review* were even burned by the U.S. Post Office.

Henry Miller's *Tropic of Cancer* (1934) was banned in the US from the 1930s until the early 1960s, seized by US customs for sexually explicit content and vulgarity. The rest of Miller's work was also banned in the United States. Radcliffe Hall's *The Well of Loneliness* (1928) was banned in the UK in 1928 for its lesbian theme.

Jack London's writing was censored in Europe in the 1920s and 1930s. In 1929, Italy banned all cheap editions of his *Call of the Wild*, and that same year Yugoslavia banned all his works as being "too radical". The Nazis also

[16] The *Decameron* was first placed on the Roman Index of prohibited books in 1559 by the order of Pope Paul IV.

[17] Censorship from 1820 to 1876 was marked by many laws to control the spread of obscenity, among them the Town Police Clauses Act of 1847 and Libel Acts of 1843 and 1845.

[18] In 1922, 500 copies of the book were burned by the United States Department of the Post Office.

burned some of his socialist-friendly books like *The Iron Heel*, along with the works of many other authors.

One of the most controversial books in the twentieth century, Nabokov's classic of forbidden love, *Lolita*, was banned in France in 1959, in Argentina in 1959, and in New Zealand in 1960. South Africa refused to allow the paperback of this novel to enter the country until 1982.

In many European dictatorships, censorship was considered to be a necessary instrument of political control. Thus, the prime mover behind censorship in Nazi Germany, the Minister of Propaganda, Joseph Goebbels, enforced strict control of all communication forms in Germany, including newspapers, magazines, books, public meetings, and rallies, art, music, movies, and radio: "The essence of propaganda consists in winning people over to an idea so sincerely, so vitally, that in the end they succumb to it utterly and can never escape from it." (Goebbels). Viewpoints in any way threatening to Nazi beliefs or to the regime were censored or eliminated from all media. Some twenty-five thousand volumes of offensive books written by Jewish authors, including Albert Einstein and Sigmund Freud, communists and humanists were burnt in Germany in 1933 in order to demonstrate the unlimited power of the Third Reich. Literature had to be successfully brought into line with Nazi ideology. Among books banned in Nazi Germany for demoralizing and insulting the Wehrmacht are such classical works as Erich Maria Remarque's *All Quiet on the Western Front* (1928), Jack London's *Call of the Wild* (1903) and John Steinbeck's *The Moon is Down* (1942). Hitler implemented the severe censorship and intolerable propaganda machine of the Nazi regime not only in Germany but also in all countries occupied during the Second World War (1939–1945).

A tyrannical political regime existed not only in Nazi Germany and in the Soviet Union but also in South Africa (1950–1994) which was distinguished by the Apartheid regime, characteristic for upholding a cruel policy of racism. In this respect, the policy of censorship under the Apartheid regime strongly resembles that in the Soviet Union, where censorship affected every aspect of cultural, intellectual and educational life. Detailed information about all items censored has been carefully compiled by the South African publisher Jacobsen, in *Jacobsen's Index of Objectionable Literature* (1996). This admirable work includes all books forbidden by the Apartheid regime. The relentless struggle against the Apartheid regime has been the subject of numerous studies, notably by the South African historian Christopher Merrett, who besides producing books such as *A Culture*

of Censorship, has also compiled a complete list of censorship throughout the history of South Africa.

South Africa's apartheid regime banned a number of classic books. In 1955, the *New York Times* reported that Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818) was banned there as indecent, objectionable, or obscene. The regime also banned Anna Sewell's *Black Beauty* (1877), an autobiographical story told by a horse, only because of the use of the word 'black' in the title. Donald Woods's biography *Biko* (1978) about Black Consciousness Movement leader and anti-apartheid activist Steve Biko was also banned for its criticism of the apartheid system and white government.

Chapter Four

Robert Burns: a Scottish Bard

Few poets anywhere in the world have acquired such unchallengeable status as national icons as Robert Burns (1759–1796), best-loved Scottish poet and a "heaven-taught ploughman", a term coined by Henry Mackenzie, a famous Scottish writer, in his review of the Kilmarnock edition of Burns's *Poems Chiefly in the Scottish Dialect*. Despite a humble background and lack of formal education, Robert Burns with his, for that time, unusual and almost unacceptable poetry, rose from poverty and neglect to glory and literary immortality. His life and work, as a poet and a song-writer, provided a focus for the incipient revival in Scottish poetry and in particular for writing in the Scottish vernacular. Burns's poetry was so enlivened by wit as to reach readers well beyond the academic field:

Some rhyme a neebor's name to lash;
Some rhyme (vain thought) for needfu' cash:
Some rhyme to court the countra clash,
    An' raise a din;
For me, an aim I never fash;
    I rhyme for fun
(To J. S****': 25–30)[19]

His enormously popular work established several fashions in poetry that have remained influential even to the present. How is it possible? Great poetry is based on paradoxes, provokes debates, makes people think and at the same time is open to different interpretations.

[19] Burns's originals are taken from Robert Burns 1993. *The Complete Poetical Works of Robert Burns*. James. A. Mackay (ed.). Alloway Publishing: Catrine.

Robert Burns is, undoubtedly, not only the most famous Scottish bard but also one of the great figures in European poetry of the eighteenth century. Wordsworth identified "the presence of human life" in his poetry and Scott believed that, of all the authors he had known, only Burns and Byron wrote with complete spontaneity (qtd. in Low 1975: 2). There have been so many editions of Burns that J. W. Egerer, the author of *Bibliography of Robert Burns* (1964: viii), believed that his popularity in the last century may have been even greater than Shakespeare's. Combining Standard English with Scottish vernacular, Burns liberated the language, allowing freedom to the Romantic Movement, and his use of old folk tunes enhanced Scottish musical tradition. Unfortunately, Burns had only twenty years as a writer; however, in the thirty-seven years of his life, he published literally hundreds of poems, songs and letters.

Robert Burns's life was truly uneventful because he never left his native land. Born in Ayrshire on the 25th of January 1759 in the little town of Alloway, where his father William Burns took a plot of land on lease, Burns spent his youth in Tarbolton, where he attended school, learned tailoring and helped his father[20]. By the age of fifteen, Burns was laboring in the fields and presumably contracted a rheumatic heart-condition that eventually caused his death.

Nevertheless, as David Daiches (*Robert Burns and His World*, 1972) and Tom Crawford (*Burns: A Study of the Poems and Songs*, 1960) note, Burns was not at all a simple farmer as he received a fairly extensive education at his father's insistence. Despite their family's limited means, Burns was trained by a private tutor, John Murdoch, in English Literature "derived mainly from Arthur Masson's anthology" (Simpson 2003: 4). Burns was familiar with Pope's translation of Homer, the style of the Augustan poets, and the writings of Shakespeare, Thomson, Shenstone, Mackenzie, and Locke (see Murison 1975: 54–59). Yet, there was also the strong influence of his mother and her kinswoman, Betty Davidson, who granted Burns access to the native oral tradition.

Burns began writing songs at sixteen under the combined impact of love for a local girl and a competition with his friend. In his first song, "O, Once I love'd a Bonie Lass", also known as "Handsome Nell", Burns successfully used both Scots and English vocabulary for the first time, skillfully shifting from one level to another. In the future, Burns produced numerous

[20] This image of Burns as a barely educated ploughman was used to promote his poetry in the Soviet Union.

poems and especially songs composed in a blending of Standard English and Scottish vernacular.

Once I lov'd a bonie lass,
Ay, and I love her still;
And whilst that virtue warms my breast,
I'll love my handsome Nell.

As bonie lasses I hae seen — *hae – have*
And mony full as braw; — *bonie – pretty*
But, for a modest gracefu' mein, — *lass – girl*
The like I never saw.

A bonie lass, I will confess,
Is pleasant to the e'e; — *e'e – eye*
But, without some better qualities
She's no a lass for me.

But Nelly's looks are blythe and sweet,
And what is best of a', — *a' – all*
Her reputation is complete,
And fair without a flaw.

She dresses aye sae clean and neat, — *aye – always*
Both decent and genteel; — *sae – so*
And then there's something in her gait
Gars ony dress look weel.

A gaudy dress and gentle air — *air – early*
May slightly touch the heart;
But it's innocence and modesty
That polishes the dart

'Tis this in Nelly pleases me,
'Tis this enchants my soul;
For absolutely in my breast
She reigns without control.

Burns worked largely as a satirist and a familiar-epistle poet to the age of twenty-seven. Devastated by poverty and unable to earn enough to support his mother, three brothers and three sisters after the death of his father, Burns decided to emigrate to Jamaica but first arranged his poems for the publication and proposed marriage to his mistress Jean Armour. Jean, who later became Burns's wife, rejected him even though she was pregnant at

that time. However, Burns's first book of poetry *Poems*, *Chiefly in the Scottish Dialect* published by John Wilson at Kilmarnock in Ayrshire made him famous. The proposal to publish this book is first mentioned in a letter to Robert Aiken dated 3. 04. 1786 in which Burns writes: "My proposals for publishing I am just going to send to the press". On 15.04 he wrote to Gavin Hamilton: "My proposals came to hand last night, and I know you would wish to have it in your power to do me a service as early as anybody, so, I enclose you half a sheet of them" (Egerer 1965: 7–8).

This first edition contained most of Burns's most popular poems: "To a Mouse", "To a Mountain Daisy", "The Cotter's Saturday Night", "The Epistle to Davie", "The Twa Dogs", "The Holy Fair", etc. One of Burns's most famous satirical poems "Holly Willie's Prayer", revealing hypocrisy of some members of the Kirk (church) and constructed in the form of a prayer, was not included in this edition due to the censorship of the time as well as a famous cantata "Jolly Beggars". This first literary attempt brought Burns immediate popularity, so, instead of sailing for the West Indies, he went up to Edinburgh where, during the winter of 1786, Burns became the chief literary celebrity of the season. Reviews of the Kilmarnock edition appeared in *The Edinburgh Magazine*, or *Literary Miscellany*, IV (October 1786); *The Lounger*, no. 97 (December 1786) and *The Monthly Review*, London, LXXV (December 1786) (Crawford 1960: 109). The entire print-run of 612 copies sold out within a month. This first edition was soon republished in Edinburgh in 1787.

I wish I could say that Robert Burns's immediate success brought him not only glory but also strong financial support. However, Burns's life was unsettled and far from easy and comfortable after the triumph of his first winter in Edinburgh.

After 1787 Burns devoted himself to collecting, writing and rewriting folk songs and became the literary editor of most of James Johnson's volumes *The Scots Musical Museum*. Before his death Burns created over two hundred songs of his own.

After leaving several mistresses, Burns finally married Jean Armour in 1788 (they had nine children together) and arranged to lease a new farm at Ellisland. Even though Burns was given a post at last with the Excise, often riding and hard work did not do him any good. His last literary poem was "Tam o' Shanter" written in 1790.

In 1791 Burns with his family moved to Dumfries. Until his death in 1976 Burns continued altering old songs and writing his own. Robert Burns died on the 21st July 1796 at the age of thirty-seven of rheumatic heart disease which is thought to have been caused by overwork on the farm at a young age. His funeral was at St Michael's Kirkyard in Dumfries. Jean Armour gave birth to their ninth child, Maxwell Burns, on the very same day.

In talking about the outstanding emotional power of Burns's poetry, its special melodic style and lively colourful images, it should be noted that he freed contemporary poetry from the prevailing theatrical and pompous style, endowing it with lively dialect speech. Stupendous powers of poetic creation allowed him to represent the commonest things of everyday life, or the commonest feelings of the most ordinary person, bringing the reader as close to the experience as possible. Burns's poetry, free from artificial expressions, depicted human life, human passions, desires and delights with an overwhelming simplicity.

Burns's poetry also drew upon a substantial familiarity with and knowledge of Classical, Biblical, and English literature, including the originator of English national literature, Geoffrey Chaucer (1340–1400), the author of the famous *Canterbury Tales* (1388–1400), as well as English poets of the Elizabethan Age, Philip Sidney (1554–1586) and Edmund Spenser (1552–1599), the author of *The Faerie Queene* (1589–1596). In fact, Burns often used the "Spenserian stanza", iambic pentameter with the rhyme scheme a b a b b c b c c [c] and the final line being a hexameter which has six feet or stresses. In Burns's poetry we can find numerous references to the poets of the English Renaissance and Enlightenment: Alexander Pope, the author of *The Essay on Man*, William Shenstone (1732–1763), James Thomson, the author of *Seasons* (1726–1730), George Crabbe (1754–1832), Thomas Gray (1716–1771), the author of *An Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard* (1751), Edward Young (1683–1756), the author of a melancholy cycle of poems entitled *The Complaint*, *or Night Thoughts of Life*, *Death and Immortality* (1742–1745) and Oliver Goldsmith (1728–1774), the author of the elegy *The Deserted Village* (1770).

Burns's style of writing and especially his choice of themes were also formed under the influence of Scottish national poets from the fifteenth until the eighteenth century. Any literary history of today enumerates all that Burns inherited from past Scots literary tradition: the mock elegies, the satires, the poems on country fairs, folk life and amusements, including drinking songs, verse epistles, often of a humorous type, and, finally, the

folk-songs. According to David Sampson, "Burns confronted the English literature milieu as the representative of an essentially foreign culture, Scottish, rural and 'low', although he did so with the authority of poetic excellence" (1985: 16).

Since the time of the Reformation and the union of the crowns of England and Scotland, the Scottish vernacular had largely fallen into disuse as a medium for dignified writing. Shortly before Burns's time, Allan Ramsay (1680–1758) and Robert Fergusson (1750–1774), members of the Scottish Renaissance, were the leading figures in a revival of the vernacular, and Burns received from them a national tradition which he succeeded in carrying to its highest level.

Robert Fergusson has often been portrayed as a forerunner to Burns. In fact, many of Burns's poems are undisguised development of Fergusson's[21]. The two poets shared a lively appreciation of Scottish motifs, characters, songs, the Scots and vernacular poetry. For his vernacular verse, Burns had recourse mainly to the staves already popularized by Ramsay, Fergusson and other poets of the revival – a six line verse, the scheme a a a b a b with shorter fourth and sixth lines. This verse form, widely used in the poems of Ramsay and Fergusson, is also known as 'Standard Gabi'[22], but only Burns developed its hidden rhythmic and modulation capability for use in elegies, epistles, and many occasional poems. The first poem written in this verse is "Poor Mailie's Elegy" (1783), in which Burns skillfully combined humor and pathos,

Lament in rhyme, lament in prose,
Wi' saut tears trickling down your nose
Our bardie's fate is at a close,
    Past a' remead!
The last sad cap-stane o' his woes;
    Poor Mailie's dead!
(Burns: 1–6)

Here 'Standard Gabi' is used with its characteristic tone and refrain. Following the example of Ramsay and Hamilton of Gilbertfield, Burns also

[21] Burns expresses his admiration in the lines: "O thou, my elder brother in misfortune / By far my elder brother in the Muse" ("Apostrophe to Fergusson").

[22] The use of 'Standard Gabi' in Scottish tradition is explained in the article "An Example of Robert Burns' Contribution to the Scottish Vernacular Tradition" by John C. Weston, 1960. *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 57, No. 4: 634–647,

employed the six-line stave for most of his vernacular epistles, for instance, to John Lapraik, James Smith and Willie Simpson.

Besides 'Standard Gabi', Burns also adopted and artistically perfected the meters traditionally associated with the Christis-Kirk stave[23] in its revised form, sometimes with Fergusson's greater freedom of rhymes. He uses the stave for five pieces: "The Holy Fair", "Halloween", "The Ordination", "A Dream", "The Mauchline Wedding" and for a recitative in "The Jolly Beggars". Another verse adopted by Burns is the complicated Cherrie-and-Slae stanza[24] with its musical background. The peculiarity of the stave is the final wheel of four – properly six – lines, borrowed from a stave of the old Latin hymns, and affixed to a ten-line stave, common from an early period in English verse It is usually pointed out that in his refrains Burns faithfully observes certain established conventions: in an elegy each stanza usually ends on 'dead', in the Christis-Kirk stave on 'day' or 'night' (Wittig 1958: 200).

Scottish vernacular in Burns's poetry

The use of Scottish vernacular has a special place in Burns studies. Thomas Crawford suggested that the difference between English and Scottish vernacular was not "a matter of different languages but rather different registers of usage within the same language" (1979: 11). That could be true for Scots, but not for English critics. During the poet's life his use of vernacular[25] was obviously a potential disqualification for success as a poet because his poetry differed so much from the prevailing mode of polite English literature in his colloquial speech and humour, his 'low' thematic and his use of the vernacular. According to Sampson, it was only after the poet's death that his use of language was discussed by English reviewers as a poetic style (1985: 16).

[23] It is formed by the addition of a bobwheel to the old ballad octave in rollicking metre.
[24] First used by Montgomerie in "The Cherrie and the Slae".
[25] Burns's poetic predecessor, Robert Fergusson, also wrote poetry in both the Scottish vernacular and in the English language. Burns wrote three poems dedicated to Fergusson (more than he wrote about any other poet).

As Carol McGuirk observes, Burns's careful blending of "vernacular Scottish enlivens the sentimental, while the generalizing, self-consciously poetic English component broadens the significance of the vernacular [to create] an inimitable effect of meaningful simplicity, an effect by no means characteristic of all poets in the Scottish folk tradition" (1985: xxii).

Burns had chosen Scottish dialect after encountering by chance the brilliant dialect poems of Fergusson[26]. It should be noted that Burns's earlier work is written in Standard English ("Song Composed in August" and "Mary Morison"). It was an adult choice of Scottish dialect as the vehicle for poetic expression that embraced local, national and international. Fergusson also suggested to Burns many of his most famous works, for instance the poem "Cotter's Saturday Night" was inspired by Fergusson's "Farmer's Ingle".

According to Liam McIlvanney:

> There is little warrant for viewing eighteenth-century Scottish culture as bifurcated between two monolithic and antagonistic movements, the Scottish Enlightenment and the Vernacular Revival: the one, a cosmopolitan movement, concerned to explore a universal 'science of man' through the medium of metropolitan English; the other, a movement to preserve and valorize native language and traditions, maintaining cultural difference and distinct national manners (2005: 28).

Robert Burns is a case in point, his works and his cultural activities tending to "express a mind in motion, giving itself over at times to *conflicting* principles and feelings" (Crawford 1997: 104).

Burns was especially praised for his skill in wedding the two linguistic traditions. According to David Murison (1975: 54), Burns had two languages at his disposal because, despite the fact that Scots and English were essentially dialects of the same original language, Anglo-Saxon, Scots had a considerable Norse element and some Dutch, French and Gaelic not shared with English. The vowel and to a lesser extent the consonant system were different. There were some distinctions in the grammar forms, especially in the verbs and there were a great many subtle distinctions in syntax and idiom. Considering these differences had been established by the late fifteenth century, it was possible to talk about two distinct languages. Scots prose was reduced to the level of a dialect, and in the eighteenth century it hardly existed as a literary form. In verse, however, it was not lost.

[26] Fergusson's Scots dialect was richer and fuller than that used by Burns who was restricted to the Southwest of Scotland.

It should be noted that the tradition of Scottish poetry started in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries when the poetry was still medieval and had much in common with other medieval European poetry. The first best known poem in Scotland, marking the beginning of the Golden age of Scottish literature, is *Kingis Quair* which is said to be written by James I of Scotland (1394–1437), describing the king's capture and imprisonment. The poem is written in a courtly manner and presents a mixture of an allegorical dream vision and realistic description. The style of writing is very near to Chaucer's. The *Kingis Quair* uses the Chaucerian seven-line rhyme scheme, ABABBCC, called rhyme royal.

Burns skillfully manipulated both linguistic levels in his poetry, mixing varying degrees of Scots with Standard English and Anglicized Scots. Most modern critics (e.g. Andrews, Corbett, Crawford, Daiches, McGuirk, McIlvanney, Murison, and Scott) tend to discuss how well Burns was able to succeed in one tongue or the other, considering his mastery of both languages as the evidence of his artistic genius. Even in his Scots poems he often slips into English – or something closely resembling it. In fact, in Burns's very first song "Handsome Nell" his vocabulary was both Scots and English.

In "Tam O'Shanter", most of the comments expressing communal attitudes or the imagined words of the different characters are in plain Braid Scots: "Ah, Tam! Ah, Tam! thou' ll get thy fairin![27] / In hell they'll roast thee like a herrin!" (201–202).

But in one, at least, the tonality is somewhat different:

> Care, mad to see a man sae happy
> E'en drown'd himsel amang the nappy… *nappy – ale*
> Kings may be blest, but Tam was glorious,
> O'er a' the ills o' life victorious!
> (Burns: 50–53)

Though these lines are unmistakably Scots, only a small change of spelling ("glorious"/"victorious") is required to make the couplet sounds more English. After this, Burns returns, as it were, to the home key,

> Nae man can tether time or tide;
> The hour approaches Tam maun ride *maun – must*
> (Burns: 67–68)

[27] Present from a fair.

According to Thomas Crawford, he "found himself poised between two languages, two mental worlds" (1994: 2), skillfully manipulating colloquial Scots. Perhaps, Burns's language should be termed 'near-English' or 'Scots-English'. Thus, the combination of a biblical English "a pillar o' thytemple" (27) or "thy flock" (30) and down-to-earth Scots creates a humorous effect in "Holy Willie's Prayer", revealing the two faces of Willie's character,

Yet I am here, a chosen sample,
To shew thy grace is great and ample,
I am here, a pillar o' thy temple
    Strong as a rock;
A guide, a ruler and example
    To a' Thy flock
(Burns: 25–30)

Besides, I farther maun avow,	*maun – must*
Wi' Leezie's lass, three times I trow;	*throw – think*
But Lord, that Friday I was fou	*fou – drunk*
When I cam near her,	
Or else, thou kens, thy servant true,	*kens – know*
Wad never steer her.	*wad – would*

(Burns: 43–48)

In the poem "The Holy Fair", Burns uses vernacular to present abstract ideas in terms of a convincing realistic picture taken from everyday life,

While Common-sense has taen the road	*taen – taken*
An aff up the Cowgate	*aff – off*
Fast, fast that day	

(Burns: 34–36)

According to Murison, Burns uses Scots in description and narrative, in which the poet intimately participates, mostly in the folk and native poetry; and English or Anglicized Scots for the more reflective and philosophical passages, "when the poet steps back as a commentator and adopts a persona more remote from his subject" (1975: 62). As, for instance, is evident in the poem "The Cotter's Saturday Night" written in the eighteenth-century Augustan or sentimental diction, in which standard English is used to describe family worship.

It would not, however, be accurate to say that Burns in his Scots poems only expresses emotion without regard for thought. A good example is the

poem "To a Mouse", in which the nostalgic feeling of change and passing time is evoked, not by abstractions, but by pictures of concrete experience, by power of direct, concrete expression of emotion which arises out of a given situation. Burns employs not only Scots in this poem, but even an exaggeratedly archaic Scottish dialect,

Wee, sleeket, cowran, tim'rous beastie,
O, what panic's in thy breastie!
Thou need na start awa sae hasty,
Wi' bickering brattle!
I wad be laith to rin an' chase thee,
Wi' murd'ring pattle!
(Burns: 1–6)

However, the second stanza of the poem is written in reflective and controlled English,

I'm truly sorry Man's dominion
Has broken Nature's social union,
An' justifies that ill opinion,
Which makes thee startle,
At me, thy poor, earth-born companion,
An' fellow-mortal!
(Burns: 7–12)

Various dialects in the Scottish language made a complicated linguistic situation even harder. There are many words in Burns's vocabulary that belong to the dialect of his native place, Kyle, for example, icker – spike, kiaugh – sorrow, gloaming – darkness, winze – curse, raucle – rough. However, his vocabulary is eclectic, avoiding the purely provincial.

The complexity of dialects was so exceptional and original that Burns had to write a special glossary of the Scots words he thought needed explanation to his poem "Halloween". This was why Burns tried to achieve linguistic synthesis in his poems, borrowing words from other Scottish dialects, and creating his own neologisms, for instance, 'clachan' (a small village about a church, a hamlet), 'fetch' (to stop suddenly and then come on too hastily), 'hoddan' (the motion of a sage country farmer on an old cart horse), 'blink' (a glance, a short space of time, a smiling look, to look kindly), 'whid' (the motion of a hare running but not frighten, a lie" (Murison 1975: 63). In creating a personal vocabulary of over 12, 500 words, from which two to three thousand can be found only in dialects, Burns stands quite unrivalled.

To compare, nowadays there are barely five hundred exclusively dialectal words in the vocabulary of the modern Scot.

The orthographical features of Scottish dialect, which were often used in Burns's poetry include:

– reduced endings (fi' (full), fa' (fall), ca'(call), hae (have), ha (hand), min (mind), rattlin' (rattling);
– voiceless *d* at the end of the words (use't (used), likit (liked);
– use of *ie* instead of English *y* at the end of the word (Willie, bonnie, leddie);
– diagraphs *ae* (fae (foe), nae (no), *ai*: laird (lord), *au*: auld (old), *eu*: beuk (book), and *ui*: guid (good);
– sound (*x*) which is absent in English language (Lochryan, fecht);
– use of the vowel *i* (mither, thegither, wird) instead of *o* (mother, together, world) and *a* (na, wha) instead of English *o* (no, who).

Among lexical features are:

– nouns such as e'e (eye) and shoo (shoe) which have the ending *n* in plural (een, shoon);
– regular use of plural subject *ye* beside standard "you";
– beside "not" *no* and *na* are also used (*no* is used separately with the verb and *na* together (wasna, didna, hadna);
– *so* is used instead of *if* (qtd. in Arinshtein[28] 1982: 578–579).

Dialectal synonyms in Burns's poetry can be divided into three groups (Keith 1956: 128–130): synonymic orders from Scottish dialect and the North England dialect; synonymic orders which combine dialect words and words from Standard English and mixed synonymic orders.

The first group contains words which belong to different Scottish dialects and share semantic identity. They are distinguishable from each other only through pronunciation, which depends on the geographical position of the dialect. For instance *ahin*/*behint* – *behind* ('ahin' belongs to the Aberdeen dialect, 'behint' to the Lancashire and North Derby dialect); *ault*/*eilid* – *old*, *old age* ('ault' belongs to different North and South dialects, 'eilid' to

[28] Quoted from Arinshtein's commentary published in: Robert Burns. 1982. *Stihotvorenia i pesni*. [Poems and Songs]. K. Atarova (ed.). Moskva: Raduga: 561–670.

the Lancashire dialect); *aneugh*/*aneuch*, *eneugh*/*enow* – *enough* ('aneugh' – Aberdeen dialect, 'aneuch' – Yorkshire and Derby dialects, 'enough' – Cumberland dialect, 'enow' – South Scotland dialect) and *gae*/*gang* – *go* ('gae' – North Lancashire dialect, 'gang' – Dorset dialect).

The following examples illustrate the use of such dialect words in Burns's poems:

There's auld Rob Morris that wons in yon glen, He'e the king o'guild fellows and wale o' auld men! (Burns, "Auld Rob Morris": 1–2)	*yon – yonder, guild – good,* *wale – choice, o' – of*
My trunk of eild, but buss or bield, Sinks in Time's wintry rage. (Burns, "The Winter of Life": 11–12)	*but – without, buss – bush,* *or– before*
The tappet hen, gae bring her, ben, To welcome Willie Steward. (Burns, "You're Welcome, Willie Stewart": 7–8)	*gae – go*
The a-faulding let us gang My bonnie dwaire. (Burns, "Ca' the Yowes to The Knowes": 7–8)	*gang – go*

To the second group belong words or word expressions which could be (or were) changed to similar words or word groups. Besides dialect words, to this group belonged also Standard English words and archaic words, used only in dialects. For example *daintie*/*couthie*/*leesome* (*daintie* – exquisite, of delicate beauty, *couthie* – agreeable, genial, kindly and *leesome* – lucky, fortunate, agreeable); *billie*/*carl*/*chiel*/*cock*/*loon* (*billie* – abbreviated "William", *carl* – a strong, robust fellow, *chiel* – a young man, fellow, *cock* – a person, who plays minor, parts in a large organization, community and *loon* – a worthless, sorrowful or lazy fellow); *cantie*/*darf*/*gawsie* (*cantie* – cheerful, lovely, *darf* – insane, crazy, simple, foolish and *gawsie* – well-dressed, of cheerful appearance) and *crunzie*/*gab*/*mouth* (*crunzie* – throat, mouth, *cab* – slang mouth) (Keith 1956: 128–130).

Mixed synonymic orders are presented through geographically variable variants: *claeding*, *claethin*, *clouts*, *claes*; *chiel*/*chield*, *loon*, *loun*, *lown*; *fiere*, *frien*, *frined*.

Burns used dialects to embellish his poetic language with fresh images, to recreate the unique atmosphere of the folk songs, and to achieve au-

thenticity. Of course, the choice to use exclusively dialect or combinations of Standard English depended on the goal, theme and style of the poem. Almost all the political and some of the patriotic Scottish songs, for example "My Heart is in the Highland" and "Robert Bruce's March to Bannockburn", were written in English, as well as the lyric songs ("Sweet Afton"). English dominates in "The Jolly Beggars". When Burns explained to his friend Thompson the necessity to keep the Scottish dialect in the folk songs, he meant "a dash of our native language", "a sprinkling", "and slight intermixture of Scots words". If we sum up all these facts, we can say that by using the English language and Scottish dialects, Burns created his own unique style of writing.

Burns's songs: Scottish oral tradition

Many great writers and poets such as Walter Scott affirmed the fact that Robert Burns actually saved the Scottish folk song from completely disappearing, which was a hard task considering the fact that in the seventeenth century the tradition of folk songs had been almost broken under the influence of the church and, as a result, became hopelessly degraded in point both of decency and literary quality. From 1787 Burns turned his attention to the gathering and writing of songs. His achievements as a lyricist indicate extraordinary gifts of sympathy, humour, sentiment and emotion, combined with a great mastery of expression. Scarcely any known author has succeeded as well in combining his work with folk material, or in carrying on with such continuity of spirit the tradition of popular song.

The Puritan austerity of the centuries following the Reformation had discouraged secular music, like other forms of art, in Scotland. Sometimes only a few lines from a whole song could be found in musical almanacs ("Deil tak the wars", "We're a'kissed sleeping").

This almost complete downfall of the folklore tradition defined the main tendency of Burns's work. He did not merely rewrite what was left from songs, he also tried to renovate what was lost or completely changed. Burns's method, as he told himself, was to become familiar with the traditional melody, to catch a suggestion from some fragment of the old song and to fix upon an idea or situation for the new poem.

Burns's later literary output consisted almost entirely of songs, both original compositions and adaptations of traditional Scottish ballads and folk songs. He contributed some two hundred songs to the Scots Musical Museum (6 vol., 1783–1803), a project initiated by the engraver and music publisher James Johnson. Beginning in 1792, Burns wrote about one hundred songs and some humorous verse for *Select Collection of Original Scottish Airs*, compiled by George Thomson. Among his songs in this collection are such favourites as "Fair Eliza", "Comin' Thro' the Rye", "Scots Wha Hae", "A Red, Red Rose", "The Banks o' Doon", "John Anderson, My Jo", "What Can a Young Lassie Do Wi' An' Old Man", "Wha is That at My Bower Door" and "Green Grow the Rashes". These are purely lyrical pieces, which Burns claims as his own, though they are suggested by older songs, characteristic examples. One of his first songs is "Song Composed in August", which Burns wrote at the age of seventeen. Songs and poems of that period combined fresh comprehension of the world with imitation of the poets whose works Burns had read.

In the eighteenth century, many folk songs were modified to bring them near the dominant genre of sentimental poetry. In Burns's interpretations, we can see an attempt to keep the authentic mode of folk poetry with all its stylistic peculiarities. Burns even had to defend his principles in correspondence with George Thompson, who persisted in anglifying folk songs, to "avoid the insulting of fair maids and social morality" (Kinsley 1970: 17).

The degree of rewriting of original material was never stable, mainly because of the large and various inheritance of old verse, which Burns was free to manipulate and reshape. Sometimes his songs were only partly refashioned and sometimes almost re-created when he left just a couple of fragments from the original text. A song could also be a collage from several other songs as, for example, "A Red, Red Rose" or the song "A Man's a Man for a' That", which consists of parts of Jacobin songs, drinking-songs and Burns's own verses. The very first line of the song "Oh Whistle, and I'll Come to You, my Lad" originated in folklore; the rest of the poem was Burns's own creation.

According to Sydney Goodsir Smith, Burns's songs fall into three categories: original songs by Burns written to existing airs; old fragments, with sometimes only the refrain or title surviving, which he completed or refurbished; and old songs of "an indelicate nature" to which he wrote new words (1954: 330).

Because of the close connection of Burns's songs with folk music, they were mainly meant to be sung instead of read. He based his style on contrasts between short, expressive words from the Scottish dialect and melodic Gaelic music. The extraordinary expressiveness of Burns's songs was achieved through careful choice of words, rhymes and special rhythmic organization. For example, each of the 14 lines in the song "The Lass of Cessnock Banks" ends with the word "een" (eyes), which demands endless fantasy in the choice of rhymes. In his best songs, "Red, Red Rose" and "John Anderson, My Jo", Burns achieved a laconic and simple style with just a few carefully chosen expressive metaphors.

Burns often used reiterations of sounds, alliteration and dissonance not just to decorate the poem but also to stress its meaning. For example, the use of reiteration of the final rhyme in the middle of the next line is characteristic of Gaelic poetry (the so called 'aiciill'). Burns also played with names, which necessarily created multiple associations as in the following example.

Braw, brae lads on lads on Yarrow braes	*braw – courageous*
They rove the blooming heather,	*brae – shore*
But Yarrow braes, nor Ettrick shaws	*shaw – forest*
Can match the lads o'galla Water	
(Burns, "Braw Lads O' Galla Water": 1–4)	

Burns's songs in Russian translations did not avoid ideological adaptations. In the nineteenth century Burns's songs were sentimentalized, while in the Soviet Union the translators softened erotic connotations, which in some cases almost completely changed the impact of the song.

Chapter Five

The First Translations of Robert Burns in Russia

This chapter will introduce the most interesting examples of the first translations of Robert Burns into Russian done in the nineteenth century under the influence of current ideologies. At first glance it might seem ironic to discuss the influence of ideology on Burns's translation in Tsarist Russia as it cannot be compared to the severe ideological pressure in the Soviet Union. However, it would be a mistake to think that there was no official censorship in Imperial Russia in the nineteenth century. In fact, ideology played an important role in the stability of an imperial space, based on two primary principles: absolute monarchy and orthodox religion. The church acted as the main ideological support for Russian imperialism. The National Library of Russia, custodians of a Secret Department until 1917, holds collections such as *The Free Russian* print collection (approximately fifteen thousand items) which contains banned and illegal publications printed in Russia and abroad between 1853 and 1917. Furthermore, the library holds the complete printed records and catalogues of publications subjected to censorship during the pre-revolution period. The extensive censorship of pre-revolutionary Russia embraced all categories of printed material in all languages of the empire as well as Russian emigrant and foreign publications. The annual lists of banned books in a variety of foreign languages, such as French, Polish and German, contain both books initially forbidden and books legally imported to Russia and then banned. The total number of listed banned books, magazines and newspapers in the period 1803–1916 amounts to approximately twenty thousand items.

Talking about prevailing ideological characteristics in literature, the most strictly censored fields during the nineteenth century remained criticism of the tsarist regime and appeals to liberty and revolution. Even Alexander Pushkin (1799–1837) was punished for his revolutionary poetry and sent

from August 1824 to August 1826 to Mikhaylovskoe in exile. He was kept under surveillance after postal officials intercepted a letter in which Pushkin expressed thinly-veiled support for atheism. Speaking of the relations between the greatest Romantic poet and the officials, I should mention that Alexander Pushkin's long poems "Epistle to the Censor" (1822) and "Second Epistle to the Censor" (1824) were not published in his lifetime. Moreover, Pushkin narrowly escaped more severe punishment for spreading his poems among the Decembrists, participants of the Decembrist Uprising in 1825. His world famous drama *Boris Godunov* was passed for publication only as a tsar's wedding gift – after four years of waiting for authorization – under Pushkin's own responsibility.

Translations into Russian attracted the special interest of censors, even more so than foreign works imported in the original languages, precisely because of their greater accessibility. A. N. Radishchev mocked the censor in a famous passage in his *Путешествие из Петербурга в Москву* (Journey from Petersburg to Moscow), in which he mentioned a translated novel brought for approval to a local administrative unit. Following the author, the translator used the expression "лукавый бог" (*deceitful god*) which was "inked out" by the censor because it was inappropriate to call the divinity "deceitful". In the same work, Radishchev included a long essay on the history of censorship in Western Europe, exposing the harm it brought to society and culture there. In a sarcastic tone, he pointed out the illogical reaction of a Russian censor when he permits the publication of a foreign book in the original and then bans the very same book in translation (1938: 343).

Censorship was a large part of Russian history, not just of books but also of periodicals, plays and music. This trend started long before Nicholas I, but his reign (1825–1855), reinforced and extended the prohibitions. According to the statute on censorship of 1828:

> Works of literature, science, and art are to be banned by the censors: (a) if they contain anything that tends to undermine the teachings of the Orthodox Greco-Russian church, its traditions and rituals, or in general the truths and dogmas of the Christian faith; (b) if they contain anything infringing upon inviolability of the supreme autocratic power or upon the respect for the imperial house, or anything contradicting basic government legislation (Karolides/Bald/Sova 1999: 156).

Tsarist censorship was remarkable in its diversity and lasted until the early twentieth century. During the reign of Nicholas I, the censors joined with

the secret police to screen public and private morality, seeing that writers did not offend religion, the state order, morality, or even the proper use of the Russian language. Other special censors controlled foreign publications in Russia. In practice, the censorship pyramid under Nicholas I had many similarities to censorship in the Soviet Union. However, pre-revolutionary censorship was purely defensive in purpose and was based on existing press legislation (Blyum 2003: 14).

As a result of this censorship policy, the first critical notices began to appear which objected strongly to 'free' translation or 'variation' at the expense of fidelity to the foreign original.

Ideological restrictions, aimed at preventing any criticism of the monarchy or glorification of revolution from appearing in official publications, may also be observed in the first translations of Robert Burns in Russia[29].

The history of the Russian translation of Burns's poetry began less than five years after the poet's death in 1796. In 1800 an anonymous prose translation of Burns's "Address to the Shade of Thomson" (1791) was published in the literary magazine *Ипокрения или утехи лепословия* (1800, 7: 16). It was obvious from the translation that it was not Robert Burns who interested the translator but James Thomson, the outstanding poet of the "Seasons", who was highly praised by Russian romantics. This first translation attracted hardly any attention of Russian readers and critics. Unfortunately, there is insufficient evidence about the first response of the public to this attempt, which remained the only one for quite some time.

Even though the first appearance of Burns in Russian did not cause a sensation, information about the poet whose last name was translated in Russian as Borns, Bjurns, or even Barns, appeared a few times in some Russian magazines and textbooks[30]. In short remarks included in chapters about English poetry, Burns was characterized as a poet who glorified his native land, the beautiful banks of Devon, the warrior's return home, folk superstitions, fervent and undefeated love and whose style of writing appeared to be cheerful, satiric, simple and tender (1821: XC-XCI).

[29] Even so, the changes made in his poetry in order to convert it to the beliefs and values of Russian society in the nineteenth century can hardly be compared with the manipulation of his texts in the Soviet Union.

[30] An article about Burns was published in the French magazine *Revue Encyclopedique*, popular in Russia.

It is only in the late 1850s that Russian translators of Burns began to produce versions that resembled our modern notion of faithful translation. Earlier attempts to assimilate Burns into Russian culture had been characterized by the tendency to recast his poems in agreement with the prevailing sentimental style. Thus, the first translations of Burns's poems which actually captured the attention of readers and critics were produced in 1829 by the blind poet Ivan Kozlov (1779–1840), one of the most famous sentimental and romantic poets. Like other young aristocrats of his day, Kozlov completed a few years of military service in an elite regiment and lived a somewhat dissipated and aimless life until he began to lose his sight in 1819. By 1821, Kozlov was totally blind. Having squandered his inheritance, Kozlov then turned to literature for his livelihood and came into prominence as a well-known translator of some of the most famous European poets, including Schiller, Scott, Byron and many Italian and French authors.

Kozlov faced the problem of censorship in a simple manner, completely ignoring those aspects of Burns's poetry which could be interpreted as revolutionary and threatening to the monarchy. Carefully avoiding Burns's political satires, epigrams and revolutionary-oriented lyrics, he emphasized the sentimental features of his poetry, embellishing them with Christian symbolism and particularly stressing a typically orthodox relation to destiny, human obedience to God, and the inevitability of fate. As a result, the appeal to the sentiments of freedom and citizenship, promotion of democratic issues and sympathy towards common people, the most important characteristics of Burns's poetry, are entirely missing in Kozlov's translations.

Following the first principle of romantic translation, Kozlov did not try to achieve exact fidelity to the original but to transfer the 'spirit', the emotional colour and power of Burns's poems. His first collected translations, *Сельский субботний вечер в Шотландии. Вольное подражание Р. Борнсу И. Козлова* (Saturday Evening in the Small Scottish Village; Free Imitation of Robert Burns by Ivan Kozlov), were published in 1829 in Saint-Petersburg and contained, among other poems, "The Cotter's Saturday Night" (1786) and "Stanzas to a Mountain Daisy" (1786).

Glynn Barrat, the author of the book about Ivan Kozlov as a poet and translator, acknowledges that "one of his more obvious achievements was to bring English poetry before wide Russian audiences" (1972: 14). Barrat also notices that as a poet Kozlov rarely ventured beyond the clichés

of sentimentalism and "the noisy histrionics of romanticism" (1972: 52). Reflecting the ideas of Romanticism and religious mysticism, which were characteristic of the followers of the poetical theory of Vasily Zhukovsky[31], a famous Russian Romantic poet and translator, Kozlov achieved a certain level of authenticity in his translation. It is scarcely possible to overstate the extent of Kozlov's indebtedness to Zhukovsky and of Zhukovsky's influence over him. According to Irina Semenko, "Kozlov followed Zhukovsky in his lyrical 'sadness' and 'thoughtfulness', as well as in his deliberately 'poeticizing' style" (1976: 4). In the Russian literary tradition, mysticism was understood as a result of God's action, an unmerited grace poets received from God. Zhukovsky himself took from other poets only what was agreeable to his mystical comprehension of the surrounding world. He strove to recreate, not reproduce, English and German Romantic poetry as *Russian* poetry, considering translation of verse to be original creativity and marking his subjects with his own personality and foreign texts with his own literary manner (Levin 1990: 247–250). Stating his opinion on poetic translation, Zhukovsky postulates that it is the maximum privation of liberty of one expressing his feelings (referring to meter, rhyme, and sound-constrictions) realized with the least possible manifestation of such privation of freedom. Poetry is therefore the maximum fiction and ostentation of freedom; in translating one's thoughts into words, – we altogether miss the real world.

Kozlov's devotion to Zhukovsky's translation doctrines brought some of the translation's characteristics too close to Romantic elegy or even to religious stanzas, such as the overstressed idea of resignation and obedience to god, typical mystical landscapes (graveyards, tombs, the moon, the chiming of bells), sad meditations on life, fate and the necessity of death. For instance, Kozlov's translation of the poem "To a Mountain Daisy" is unnecessarily pathetic and contains some features of a sermon. Kozlov adds an embarrassingly banal touch of his own, alluding to "тайный рок" (mysterious destiny), "усопших покров гробовой" (shroud of the deceased), "невинная душа" (innocent soul) and "жемчуг долины" (pearl of the valley). The following lines, "Till, wrench'd of ev'ry stay but Heav'n,/ He, ruin'd, sink!*"* (Burns: 47–48) were translated, "Приюта нет, он отдохнет на небесах"/ No shelter in this world, he gains his peace in Heaven.

[31] Zhukovsky was mainly a translator and rendered into Russian verse the poems of Schiller, Uhland, Herder, Byron, Thomas Moore, and others, as well as the *Odyssey*, the Hindu poem of Nal and Ramayanti, and the songs of the Western Slavonians.

Translating the poem "Cotter's Saturday night", a landmark poem in the Spenserian tradition in which Burns draws a domestic picture of rustic simplicity, Kozlov adds an all-too-sentimental note with an idealized picture of the patriarchal village way of life, stressing obedience to parents and erasing the natural tenderness of the original.

Sad reflections about the unknown, an aspiration towards distant lands, the sufferings of love, and the sadness of separation – all lived through by the poet – were the distinctive features of Kozlov's translations. He translated only poems written in Standard English, so the most distinctive feature of Burns's poetical style, a successful combination of Scottish vernacular and Standard English, remained unrecognizable.

Surprisingly, in spite of the popularity of Kozlov's translations among readers, the first reception of Burns's poetry by Russian critics cannot be described as very successful. In the beginning, critics ignored the role of Burns and devoted much more attention to Kozlov himself and his tragic destiny instead. Burns did not apparently function as a representative Romantic poet among the admirers of Byron, Pushkin and Lermontov. This is probably because Burns's poems seemed to be too 'common', too ordinary for a public mentality expecting religious revelation, pure inspiration, and stream-of-romantic-consciousness. The Russian critic, Orest Somov, mentioned in his article "Обозрение русской словесности за первую половину 1989 года" (Analysis of Russian Literature for the First Part of 1829) published in the literary magazine *Северные цветы*[32], that Burns was nothing more than a "Scottish commoner" and proclaimed Burns' poems to be "sweet plays" (1830: 1; 67).

The first official 'protector' of Robert Burns in Russia became Nikolai Polevoi (1796–1864), a literary critic who published in *Московский телеграф*[33] (literary magazine) (1829: 195–211) the first article about Burns's life in Russian, "Жизнь и поэзия Робера Бернса" (Life and Poetry of Robert Burns). Polevoi expressed his admiration of Burns as a poet of commoners and described him as a romantic genius who personified the whole Scottish nation. Considering Burns's biography as an example, Polevoi presented his idea about the ability of a man who originally belonged to the lowest level of the social hierarchy to create outstanding poetry. This vision of Burns as a romantic genius with high spirit, expressing the whole national soul, led Polevoi to criticize Kozlov's translations

[32] Severnye tsvety [North Flowers]
[33] Moskovskii telegraf [Moscow Telegraph]

for their shallowness and groundless religiosity. According to Polevoi, Kozlov presented Burns as a common peasant lad, stressing his religious obedience and solitariness and forgetting about his education, success and influence in the literary field. Talking about the various facets of Burns's poetic talent, Polevoi mentioned his famous satires "Holy Willie's Prayer" and "Address to the Devil" and stressed Burns's exactness and accuracy in creating the vivid, colourful world of Scottish life. Kozlov ignored the fact that, in the first place, Burns was a poet of the Scottish soul, passionate and incorruptible, struggling against hypocrisy and despotism. In Polevoi's opinion, Kozlov made a crucial mistake because he ignored the passionate side of Burns's lyric and his leading role in eighteenth-century literature and stressed only the sentimental idyllic features of his poetry. Kozlov's transformations made Russian readers comprehend Burns mainly as a sentimental, melancholic poet. Polevoi also mentions the obvious shallowness of the translation of "The Cotter's Saturday Night". Analyzing the first stanza of Kozlov's translation, in which he describes November snow storms and a tired ox covered with dust, Polevoi notices that the presence of dust in fields covered with snow is highly unbelievable.

The Russian critic Vissarion Belinsky followed the example of Polevoi and designated Burns a poet whose poetry belonged to the treasure of world lyric poetry (1954: 51). In the article "Собрание стихотворений Ивана Козлова" (The Anthology of Poems by Ivan Kozlov), he regretted the fact that Kozlov had not translated Burns, but had made a "free imitation", retelling the original text and integrating it into native Russian culture. As we shall see, Russification of Burns's poetry is a common occurrence in Russian translations. Analyzing Kozlov's nationalized interpretation of Burns, Belinsky expressed astonishment at the fact that Kozlov in his translation of "The Cotter's Saturday Night" replaced Burns's appeal to Scotland with an appeal to Russia. According to Belinsky, the Russian way of life was incomparable with the Scottish idyll represented in Burns's poem, and to mix two such different cultures was a mistake (1954: 72).

However, Kozlov's translations promoted the establishment of Burns's poetic reputation and his poetic image in Russia.

In 1830 Burns's poetry attracted the attention of Alexander Pushkin, who kept *The Poetical Work of Robert Burns* published in 1829, in Cheswick (collected poems in two books), in his library and admired Burns as a rebel against aristocrats.

Another Russian Romantic, Mikhail Lermontov[34], was also interested in the Scottish poet and wrote in his diary that his favourite poem, which Walter Scott refers to as a poem containing thousands of love stories, was "Ae Fond Kiss and Then We Sever",

Had we never loved so kindly
Had we never loved so blindly
Never met – o never parted
We had ne'er been broken-hearted
(Burns: 13–16)

Lermontov even translated this poem,

Если б мы не дети были,	*If we were not children*
Если б слепо не любили,	*If we didn't love blindly*
Не встречались, не прощались,	*We wouldn't have met, we wouldn't have parted*
Мы с страданьем бы не знались.	*We wouldn't have known sufferings.*
(Lermontov: 90)	

It is clear from his translation that Lermontov connected the word "kindly" (tender) with the German word "Kind" (child). This mistake suggests that Lermontov did not know Burns and translated these lines only because they were used by Byron as an epigraph to his poem "The Bride of Abydoss".

Many critics showed an interest in Robert Burns and his writings. Among the most flattering articles is a translation of an article entitled "Literature in England at the Beginning of the XIX Century" from *Dublin University Magazine* published in the Russian magazine *Телескоп*[35] (1832: 415) by an anonymous author (in this translation Burns was called Bjurns) and Oleg Senkovski's article published in the *Библиотека для Чтения*[36]. Both articles contained a biography of the author, and an interpretation and short retellings of some of his poems – "The Vision", "The Cotter's Saturday Night", "The Twa Dogs". Their enthusiastic attitude established grounds for Burns's further positive comprehension in Russia. He was pronounced to possess all the characteristics necessary for a poet – deep feelings of the heart disposed to love and to hatred, but especially to love in the whole meaning of this word: love of women, love of homeland, and love of nature. His soul was described as honourable and courageous and his bright im-

[34] In a curious twist of fate, Lermontov was killed in a place called Little Scotland, which had been founded by Scots missionaries in the Caucasus.
[35] Telescope [Telescope]
[36] Biblioteka dlia chteniia [Library for Reading]

agination, which made all his images alive, fresh and real, was considered to be one of his most precious gifts (Orlov 1939: 232).

There is one more typical feature of Burns's translations in the nineteenth century that influenced future translations of Burns into Russian. In order to clarify this point, it should be noted that the situation in Russia at the beginning of the century provided a powerful incentive to the development of Russian national culture. Russian writers, poets and composers tried to raise society's interest in the life of its people, their historical past, their songs, myths and legends. Publication of *The Song of Igor's Campaign*, and *Ancient Russian Verse* by Konstantin Danilov, as well as collections of Russian folk songs, contributed to the stimulation of this interest in native Russian culture. Genres of Russian songs and Russian tales, similar to the genres of Russian folklore, became very popular in literature.

Thus, in the magazine *Библиотека для чтения* (1837: 125–126) there appeared at the same time a retelling of Burns's famous ballad "John Barleycorn", translated in rhythmic prose as a Russian folk song (*bylina*). This transformed ballad presented an eternal myth about the dying and revival of a divinity. It seems that Burns used an old English song and rewrote it as a folk ballad which told of the 'life' of a barleycorn: his death and his new birth in "the hard stuff". Obviously, the Russian translator (in this case unknown) wanted to stress the folk spirit of the ballad for Russian readers by changing the names and inventing typical cultural items. For that reason, the ballad was entitled "Иван Ерофеивич Хлебное Зёрнышко" (Ivan Erofeich Barleycorn). The name Ivan is as popular a name in Russia as John is in England and Scotland, while Erofeich is the colloquial name of a Russian alcoholic drink, later known as 'samogon'. For the same reason, the Russification of the Scottish ballad, the translator used many expressions characteristic of the Russian epic poem (bylina): "светла вёснушка" (bright spring, the diminutive of the word "spring" is used); "окаянные нехристи" (damned pagans), as well as word transformations with the help of a few suffixes used to create a diminutive form in the Russian language, which brought the style of the poem near the Russian epic style: "головушка" (archaic expression for *head*), "солнышко" (diminutive of *sun*), "вёснушка" (diminutive of *spring*). The translator succeeded in presenting John Barleycorn to Russian readers as an example of the close connection between Burns and Scottish folk culture. At the very least, the transformation of the Scottish folk song into a Russian epic poem with fairy-tale elements (a completely different style of writing) was undeniable.

Attempts to Russify Burns's poetry and to adapt the style and imagery of Russian folklore songs became a major problem in the history of Burns's translations in Russia. The early folk-literature of Russia, wonderfully rich and extremely popular, possesses an astonishing wealth of traditions, tales, and lyric folk-songs, some of them of the greatest beauty. Archaic epic songs are deeply rooted in the nation's consciousness. The reason behind the numerous attempts to bring Burns's poetry as close to the Russian folklore style as possible could be the translators' intention to make it comprehensible for a Russian reader unfamiliar with the Scottish life-style. However, the images, symbolism and mythological features of Russian folklore are incompatible with Scottish ones. In most cases, the result of blending of the Scottish and Russian contexts in translation of Burns was unsuccessful.

A new epoch demanded different translation techniques, exactness and authenticity and not just 'cultural renewal', as the translator attempted to integrate foreign texts into native Russian culture. A new translator had to try to express the coloration of foreign culture and the spirit of foreign nationalities.

A new step in the interpretation of Robert Burns's poems was made in the 1850s when democratically oriented poets started to refer to Burns's poetry, considering Burns to be a 'democratic poet of the nation' and particularly admiring his poems "A Man's a Man for a' That" and "Lines on a Merry Ploughman", in which he passionately glorified freedom and equal rights. The sudden interest of democratic intellectuals and young radicals in Robert Burns seems logical. At that time, the most pressing question of the nineteenth century in Russia, the question of the peasants' freedom, remained unresolved. The reform of 1861, which was supposed to solve the problem, brought only greater confusion. Liberals were possessed with the idea of freedom and considered that revolutionary shocks were inevitable. In such an atmosphere the revolutionary spirit of Robert Burns and his appeal for urgent changes in society were deeply appreciated.

The famous Russian novelist and playwright, Ivan Turgenev[37] (1820–1910), who also supported the ideas of liberty and equality of rights and famously described in his novels the revolutionary doctrines which had begun to spread in Russia, was very interested in Burns's poetry. He even asked his best friend, Nikolai Nekrasov, a poet and journalist, to translate a couple

[37] The author of the novel *Fathers and Sons*, a collection of stories entitled *Sketches from a Hunter's Album*, etc.

of poems for him. After reading Burns, Turgenev called it "poetry of a clean fountain" and indicated that his poetic meter was perfect for elegies and deeply metaphysical poems (1961: 295–296). Unfortunately, Turgenev's attempts to translate Burns's poetry remained unfinished.

However, Nekrasov, a loyal radical and defender of human rights, became interested in Burns and promoted the publication of six poems translated by Mikhail Mikhailov (1829–1865) in the Russian magazine *Современник*[38] (1856: 229–236), which he edited. The choice of poems was obviously defined by their revolutionary content: "John Anderson, my Jo", "To a Mouse", "To a Mountain Daisy", "Lines on a Merry Ploughman", "John Barleycorn", and "Luckless Fortune".

Mikhailov,[39] a famous translator of Heine, philosopher and proponent of civil rights, was the first Russian translator who succeeded in expressing the dramatic humanistic pathos of Burns's poems, while maintaining his original poetic form. He achieved his aim of giving the Russian reader a more or less representative idea of Burns which did not appear earlier in Kozlov's translations but did not fully avoid unnecessary russification.

Occasionally Mikhailov managed to preserve, without sacrificing accuracy, the dramatic and poetic effectiveness of the original, such as, for instance, in his translation of "John Barleycorn" which was highly successful and republished hundreds of times in different magazines before and after 1917. The uniqueness of the style and the fairy-tale elements stressed the simplicity of the work; at the same time the solemnity of the original poem was preserved in the translation. The ballad about John Barleycorn was presented as an attempt of three tsars from the East to defeat the unbreakable John. The realistic subcontext of the ballad was successfully combined with the romanticism of a fairy-tale subject. For example the following lines "But a miller us'd him worst al all- / For he crush'd him 'tween two stones" (Burns: 42–44) were translated "А сердце мельник раздавил меж двух своих камней" / And the miller squashed his heart between two stones. The image of the heart being squashed betweens stones is a frequent image in Russian folklore songs and perfectly corresponds to the image presented in Burns's original, "And they ha'e ta'en his very heart's blood" (45).

[38] Sovremennik [Contemporary]

[39] All poems quoted in this chapter are taken from: Robert Burns. 1978. *Robert Burns v Perevodakh russkih poetov* [Robert Burns in Translations of Russian Poets]. Moskva: Molodaia Gvardiia.

However, a couple of inaccuracies still appeared. They were adequate and suitable according to the context but indicated the intention of the translator to Russify some parts of the poem. Thus, Mikhailov used archaic vocabulary, for instance the verb "сгинуть" which means "to die" or "to disappear", depending on the context. Three kings mentioned at the beginning of the poem were substituted by three tsars. Another example is the word "услада" used in the translation of the next verses,

John Barleycorn was a hero bold
Of noble enterprise:
For if you do but taste his blood
T' will make your courage rise.
(Burns: 49–52)

Ах, Джон Ячменное Зерно!	*Oh, John Barleycorn!*
Ты чудо – молодец	*You are a wonder-lad*
Погиб ты сам, но кровь твоя	*You have died, but your blood*
Услада для сердец.	*Is a delight for hearts.*

(Mikhailov: 49–52)

A certain sentimental shade serves to soften the courage and bravery stressed in the original line but again brings the poem closer to the folklore style, which is intensified by the use of "услада", an archaic Russian word for "delight", and "молодец" which can be translated as a wonder-lad or a brave lad.

In the translation of the lines "For if you do but taste his blood / 'Twill make your courage rise", epithets were used characteristic of Russian folk songs (bylina*).* Several examples immediately suggest themselves: "змея-печаль" (the snake of sorrow) and "трынь-трава" which means not care a straw/to be of a very little importance.

For if you do but taste his blood,
'Twill make your courage rise.
(Burns: 51–52)

Как раз заснет **змея-печаль**	*The **snake of sorrow** will sleep*
Всё будет **трынь трава**.	*Noone will **care a straw**.*

(Mikhailov: 51–52)

Such stylistic additions changed the style of the original poem, which was simpler and more powerful.

The inaccuracy is also evident in the translation of the word "glass" substituted with "кружка" (a tankard). This subsitution slightly changes the drink personified by John Barleycorn. While in Scotland barley was used to make not only beer but also whisky, Mikhailov's translation suggests that it was used to make exclusively beer.

The end of the ballad was properly translated, although the translator omitted the lines in which Scotland was meant, probably not to disturb the rhyme.

Mikhailov's translations are still considered the most successful of all translations of Burns's poems in Russian and can be compared to Marshak's translations.

In the sixties, more translators of Burns's poems appeared, among them Dmitry Minaev (1835–1889) and Vsevolod Kostomarov (1837–1865)[40], who was also close to the revolutionary movement. Kostomarov translated "Tam O'Shanter", "The Cotter's Saturday night". "For A' That and A' That", "I Hae a Wife o' My Ain", and "Wha is That at My Bower Door".

Kostomarov was the first Russian translator who decided to translate the poem "For A' That and A' That'" in which he used the strategy of universalization with the purpose of nationalization to make the poem more comprehensible for Russian readers. Thus, the word "the coward slave" (3) was translated "холоп", a typical Russian expression, meaning dependant peasants whose social status was almost the same as that of a slave. The word "lord" (17) was replaced with "барин", the Russian title of a feudal owner of the land, and "prince" (25) was translated as "царь" (tzar). The "hodden-gray" (10) was transformed into "кафтан", a typically Russian coat. In general, the revolutionary appeal of the original is softened in Kostomarov's translation for the sake of censorship. Thus, an appeal to pray for Sense and Worth in the last lines of the poem was substituted with an appeal to pray to God to send us his kingdom.

> Then let us pray that come it may,
> (As come it will for a' that)
> That Sense and Worth, o'er a' the earth,
> Shall bear the gree, an' a' that."
> (Burns: 33–36)

[40] Kostomarov, a democrat and revolutionary, also translated "The Cotter's Saturday", "For A' That and A' That", "I Hae a Wife O'My Ain", and "Wha is That at My Bower Door".

Молитесь все, чтоб Бог послал	*You shall all pray that God*
Нам Царствие Его;	*Send us His Kingdom.*
Чтоб честный труд на свете стал	*That honest work will become most respected*
Почтеннее всего!	*In the whole world.*
(Kostomarov: 33–36)	

The same strategy was used in Kostomarov's translation of "Tam O'Shanter". The word "chapman" (1) was replaced with "купцы", Russian merchants. The word "market" (4) was translated "базар", a Russian expression for "fair". In the phrase "Wi' mair of horrible and awful" (141) two typically Russian words were added, "хари и рожи", colloquial words for "face".

Minaev translated the poem "The Twa Dogs", again using a typically Russian expression in order to familiarize the context for Russian readers. In the eighth line the expression "his Honour's" was replaced with "вельможа", a Russian aristocrat. The expression "My honest Luath" was substituted with "любезный Люат" (47), the word 'любезный' was a popular address in Russia in the nineteenth century, expressing familiarity and usually used to address friends. In the translation of the line "What way poor bodies lived ava" (50), the word "доля" was used, a typical poetic expression for 'destiny'.

It is a sad fact that these democratic poets paid no attention to Burns's love lyrics because their translations remained the only source of Burns's poetry for Russian readers for more than fifty years and were included in the *Антология Английских Поэтов*[41] edited by Gerbel' (1875: 232–245).

At the same time, many articles about Burns appeared in which his poetry was interpreted as revolutionary-democratic, and the poet himself was presented as a brave protector of his nation, a country poet whose main aim was to defend the interests of common people. This interpretation of Burns' poetry differed from the earlier sentimental, romantic and mystical image created at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

One of the most interesting political articles was written by N. I. Utina, a member of several revolutionary radical circles. Her article "Робер Бернс, Шотландский национальный поэт" (Robert Burns, the Scottish National Poet) in *Дело*[42] (1876: 257–292) reflected an attempt to throw light exclusively upon Burns's democratic intentions. According to Utina, the main importance of Burns as a poet was his sincere closeness to the dark and

[41] [Anthology of English Poets]
[42] Delo [Work]

unhappy life of common people, their hopes, wishes and disappointments, which inspired his poetic muse. The critic expressed her astonishment at the fact that a talented young poet had chosen an absolutely prosaic, uninteresting, common everyday life for his poetic expressions. She compared Burns's social position in Scotland with the position of Russian poets and tried to analyze his inner split, which was the main reason that Burns did not find his place in society. Utina came to the conclusion that Burns's tragedy was the tragedy of all poets at that time because they could not find a place in the social order and were often dependent on their patrons.

The famous Russian poet and philosopher Ogarev wrote in his preface to the collection "Russian Hidden Literature of the Nineteenth Century" (London, 1861) that Burns was a successful exception in European literature where common people were deprived of education and did not know their own poets. According to Ogarev, common people can recognize their poet only if he lives with them and understands them. It is even more important for successful comprehension of poetry that people can hear it and not just read it (1952: 426).

Another critic, Maria Cebrikova (1835–1917), a member of one of the revolutionary circles, in her article "Роберт Бернс" (Robert Burns) published in *Мысль*[43] (1880: 102–116) called Burns a poet who expressed all the pains and sufferings of commoners, and did not have even the slightest hope for betterment. She saw a connection between Burns' ideas and those ideas which caused the French Revolution.

An article by Nikolai Storozhenko (1836–1906), the most famous Russian expert in English Literature at that time, "Английский поэты боли и страдания" (English Poets of Pain and Suffering) appeared in *Северный вестник*[44] (1893). He introduced Burns as a poet of humanity and love and considered him to be one of the greatest poets of the eighteenth century and at the same time the most original of all English poets, saying that, "The religion of his heart was love for people. He was connected with all phenomena of life and nature by his sentimental heart" (1893: 46).

It is clear that Robert Burns, with his patriotic, passionate poems, demanded the attention of those Russians who wanted change, whatever it might cost.

[43] Mysl' [Thought]
[44] Severnyi vestnik [North News]

Articles about Burns which appeared in 1896–1897 in Russian periodicals were connected mostly with the centenary of his death. Many poets and critics wrote about Burns and expressed their admiration of his poetry. Among the magazines that published essays about and criticism of Burns's poetry were Veinberg's[45] article "Роберт Бернс" (Robert Burns) published in *Русское богатство*[46] (1896: 31–54), Ivanov's[47] article "Роберт Бернс" (Robert Burns) in *Русская мысль*[48] (1896: 44–65), and Chiumina's[49] article in *Нива*[50] (1896: 483–490).

In connection with the ever increasing popularity of Burns's poetry, a decision was made to publish an anthology of his poetry. The first anthology was published by Kliukin in 1897. The question of how far the translators succeeded in their comprehension of Burns's poetry is difficult to answer in simple terms. On the one hand, Burns became well-known in the Russian cultural milieu; on the other hand, Russian translators exaggerated in adjusting Burns's poetry to their own comprehension, so sometimes a folk song was transformed into an elegy and a drinking song into a mystical lyric.

In the context of Burns's translations from the nineteenth century, two more names appear, Olga Chiumina-Mikhailova (1864–1909), who translated mostly love and nature lyrics and A. M. Fedorov who translated "John Barleycorn". Although Fedorov's translation is often included in anthologies of Burns's translations, it is not as successful as Mikhailov's or Marshak's. Fedorov's main inaccuracy is the lengthening of each stanza by adding his own lines, which disturbs the rhythm of the poem.

Chimuina-Mikhailova introduced to the Russian reader early lyric poems by Robert Burns including "Death", "To a Mountain Daisy" and "The Winter of Life". Her translations of love lyrics are still considered by many to be the best among all the others, mainly because she succeeded in saving the original meaning and style of most lyrical poems.

It is clear from the internal evidence of Chiumina-Mikhailova translations that she regarded the vernacular expressions and colloquial tone so common in Burns's lyrics as unacceptable in poetry. Her obvious dissatisfaction with Burns's folk style in such poems as "Comin Thro' the Rye",

[45] Burns's translator
[46] Russkoe bogatstvo [Russian Wealth]
[47] The Russian critic and professor of religion
[48] Russkaia mysl' [Russian Thought]
[49] The first Russian translator to translate Burns's love and nature lyrics
[50] Niva

"Contended Wi' Little" and "Auld Rob Morris" resulted in the recasting of expressions that were deemed simplistic as typical 'bookish', archaic words and phrases, – sometimes of Church-Slavonic origin – a feature characteristic of the sublime style much in use in Russian poetry at the time and more appropriate for sentimental than folk poetry. Thus, in her translations Burns's poems lost their original sincerity, humour and coloration, as can be seen, for instance, from the title of the poem "My Heart's in the Highland" which was translated "На чужбине" ('chuzhbina' is a poetical old-fashioned word for 'foreign land'). Translating the poem "My Heart's in the Highlands", Chiumina uses the words "колыбель" (cradle) instead of "birth-place" and "отчизна" (a high-style expression for homeland) instead of "Highland".

The **birth-place** of Valour, the country of Worth.
(Burns: 2)

Шотландия! Смелых
борцов **колыбель**.
(Chiumina-Mikhailova: 4)

*Scotland! The **cradle***
of courageous warriors.

The hills of the **Highlands** for ever I love.
(Burns: 4)

Люблю я и помню
отчизну мою!
(Chiumina-Mikhailova: 8)

I love and remember
*my **homeland**!*

Instead of the word "row", Chiumina used "doe" again. The translation of the word "farewell" indicates a misunderstanding on the part of the translator. Chiumina uses the Russian word "простите", which means "forgive me". As a result of this misunderstanding, the poet in Chiumina's translation asks the Highlands to forgive him instead of saying goodbye.

Farewell to the mountains, high-cover'd with snow.
(Burns: 9)

Простите, вершины скалистые гор.
(Chiumina-Mikhailova: 9)

***Forgive me**, the peaks of the mountains.*

Complex syntax coupled with frequent replacement of the supposedly 'immoral' expressions with more 'modest' ones make her style even more

obscure, sometimes to the point of incomprehensibility. Thus, in the poem "Comin' Thro' the Rye", instead of the word "petticoats" the word "платье" (dress) was used. Chiumina also mentioned "the voice", which was calling for Jenny in the rye in the first four lines.

The same is generally true of Chiumina's translations of the humorous poems.

Naebody cares for me,
I care for naebody.
(Burns, "I Hae a Wife o' My Ain": 15–16)

Обо мне никто не плачет,
И я не плачу ни о ком.
(Chiumina-Mikhailova: 15–16)

Nobody cries for me
And I cry for no one

References to "Cuckold" in the first stanza appeared to be too vulgar for Chiumina, so she erased it. As is evident from her choice of words, she translates for readers familiar with a sophisticated vocabulary, embellishing her translations with archaic expressions. For instance, in the translation of the lines "Sontenred wi' little, and carttie wi' mair" she used such words as "призрак" (ghost), "сан" (titular), "ничтожный" (miserable), "дар" (gift), "пир" (revel), "милость" (mercy), typical only of a high literary style and completely out of place in this optimistic poem.

A cheerful poem "Auld Rob Morris", in which a young peasant lad expresses his love for the daughter or a rich landlord, was transformed into a sorrowful love-confession. In the following lines Chiumina replaced "lamb" with "лань" (doe), added the adjective "mournful" to "eyes" translated as "очи", another highly poetical epithet and used "сияние дня" (shining of the day) instead of "light".

As blithe and as artless as the **lambs** on the lea,
And **dear** to my heart as **the light** to my e'e. *eyes*
(Burns: 9–10)

Беззаботна как **лань** –
и для сердца **милей**
Чем **сияние дня** для
печальных очей.
(Chiumina-Mikhailova: 9–10)

*She is as careless as a **doe***
*And is more **delightful** for the heart*
*Then the **shining of the day***
*For **mournful** eyes.*

The twelfth line, "The wounds I must hide that will soon be my death" was intended to be humorous in the original but Chiumina translated "в этой любви смерть таится моя" / my death is hiding in this love.

Sometimes Chiumina shortened original verses, added her own images and changed the metrical form. This happened in the poem "Merry Widower", which originally ends with the widower's relief because of the death of his bothersome, jealous wife. Chiumina added her own four lines to the end of the poem to bring the happy widower and the soul of his dead wife together, "ее душа опять близка моей в порывах бури"/ her soul is again closer to mine in the storms. The poem lost its original humorous style and the translation can be read almost as an elegy.

Burns's translators in the nineteenth century set themselves the task of producing free imitations rather than an accurate copy of the original. The translations of Kozlov, Chiumina-Mikhailova, Mikhailov, Kostomarov, Minaev show a degree of freedom remarkable even for the time. Judging from their translation principles and practice, they belonged to that trend in romantic translation whose adherents strove for self-expression and the realization of a subjective, ideal conception of the original. It should be remembered here that this was the era of Nicholas I, a period of despotic rule in which progressive-minded Russian intellectuals were completely alienated from social and political life and often deprived of their legal rights.

Since the translators were mainly concerned with getting their works published, in most cases they avoided Burns's revolutionary and democratic poems, giving priority to his love and nature lyrics. For the sake of easy comprehension, most of them russified Burns' context, omitting any details related to Scottish folklore, history or traditions they thought might need explanation. However, even though their translations may sound archaic now, there is no denying that they tried to reproduce the emotional range and some stylistic characteristics of Burns's poetry.

Translations of Burns's poetry included in the first anthology edited by Belousov (1897) were characterized by their resemblance to Russian poems, which are very different in style from Scottish folk songs by Burns. Russian translators tried to imitate well-known Russian poets, for example Nekrasov, Kol'cov and Nikitina. The anthology summarized all the translations of Robert Burns made before the revolution. It included only forty-eight, carefully chosen poems, among which were lyrics, satire, folk songs and epigrams, so that the Russian reader could appreciate the whole picture of Burns's diverse poetry.

Chapter Six

Influence of Ideology in the Soviet Union

After the October revolution, Russian appreciation of Burns's poetry changed completely. Since the 1930s, the communist regime had regulated literary expression through 'socialist realism'[51], an ideological program enforced by the Soviet state as the official standard for art and literature. One of the most important functions invented by the communist regime was the prescriptive function, which means that the political and ideological program was aimed not only at forbidding works from being published but also to 'educate' authors by prescribing to them precisely what and how they should write. Nothing like this had ever existed in pre-revolutionary Russia. It was an invention of Soviet times, to create a method of making the entire literary corporation write for the state. In the past censorship could only prohibit; in the Soviet Union it could both prohibit and prescribe.

According to the new standards of propaganda, literary works were prescribed to extol a new, better lifestyle of communist society in the Soviet Union, to elevate the common workers by presenting their life, work, and recreation as admirable, and to expose an unpleasant picture of the miserable life of workers and peasants in capitalist countries. In other words, its goal was to educate people in the goals and meaning of Communism. Art produced under socialist realism was supposed to be realistic, optimistic, and heroic. Its practice was marked by strict adherence to party doctrine and to conventional techniques of realism. The word 'devotion' (преданность), "with all its religious connotations" was utilized at this

[51] A new literary program, invented in 1934, with the purpose of defining each aspect of literary works written in the Soviet Union, including themes, style, prefaces etc. The term "social realism" was also used later to define monumental art in the Soviet Union. A huge influence on the development of socialist realism was Maxim Gorky, a famous Soviet author, who chaired the new Union of Soviet Writers.

time (*Pravda* 8/24/34, qtd. in Brooks 1994: 981). Socialist realism as a cultural policy had a stronger presence during the Stalin years, but the essential guidelines of this system remained dominant in Soviet culture until 1991.

In the examination of socialist realism in literary theory, Gary Soul Morson lists six features of socialist realist novels: 1) two-dimensional psychology of its heroes, notably the "positive" heroes; 2) a highly formulaic plot and style; 3) themes that to Western readers would not be amenable to novelistic treatment – for example, instead of rivals in love, the plot might centre around rival plans for constructing a machine; 4) the inclusion of political sermons; 5) a lack of irony in the plot; and (6) strong sense of closure and a mandatory "happy ending" (1979: 122).

Many official novels during the Soviet era incorporated these characteristics. Maxim Gorky was hailed as the founder of socialist realism with his novel "*Мать"* (Mother), but officials also cited the works of other party-minded writers of the 1920s as examples of a correct socialist realist approach. Among these works are "Чапаев" (1923; Chapaev) by Dmitry Furmanov, *"Цемент"* (1925; Cement) by Fyodor Gladkov, and "Разгром" (1927; The Nineteen, also known as The Rout) by Alexander Fadeyev. The most notable work included in the canon of socialist realism was "Тихий Дон" (And Quiet Flows the Don) (1928–1940) by Mikhail Sholokhov. This four-volume epic depicts life among the people known as Cossacks from 1914 to the civil war. It was published in English in two volumes: "And Quiet Flows the Don" (1934) and "The Don Flows Home to the Sea" (1940). Under Stalin's leadership, writers served as the 'engineers of human souls' and produced novels, short stories, articles, editorials, critiques, and satires within a restrictive framework in which they strove to glorify Soviet society and socialism.

To be a writer in the Soviet Union meant to be committed in public to promoting the official Soviet doctrines. The lead editorial in *Pravda*[52] began on its opening day:

> The country honours its artists of the word, 'engineers of human souls', the powerful detachment of the builders and creators of Soviet culture with a flurry of greetings and good wishes (*Pravda* 8/17/34, quoted in Brooks 1994: 981).

[52] One of the first and most important Soviet newspapers.

The First Soviet Congress of Soviet Writers completed the process of nationalizing literature after the October revolution, "The existence of a single overarching ideology, concentrated in the leading newspapers and legitimated by the totalitarian power of the state" (Brooks 1994: 975) became a chief feature of Soviet society.

> Socialist realism, the basic method of Soviet artistic literature and literary criticism, demands truthfulness (pravdivost') from the artist and a historically concrete portrayal of reality in its revolutionary development. Under these conditions, truthfulness and historical concreteness of artistic portrayal ought to be combined with the task of the ideological remaking and education of labouring people in the spirit of socialism (*Pravda* 1934: 5/6/34, qtd. in Brooks 1994: 977).

Among other things, one of the most important aims of this program was to introduce foreign authors to Soviet people as supporters of the communist regime and offer them newly adapted interpretations of famous literary works[53]. Their works had to be interpreted as communist manifests in which an individual's protest against capitalism was put in the first place. Writers' biographies and their literary works were adapted and even changed according to this new scheme. Those works which could not be properly adapted were put on a black list and forbidden.

According to Ermolaev (1997), among the authors who were put on the black list and almost never appeared in the official literature were:

- Russian dissidents and émigrés: Andrei Belyi, Mikhail Bulgakov, Nikolai Gumilev (executed in 1921), Osip Mandel'shtam (executed in 1938), Viacheslav Ivanov, Vladislav Khodasevich, Nikolai Kliuev, Vladimir Nabokov and Evgenii Zamiatin; from later authors three winners of Nobel prize in literature: Ivan Bunin (emigrated in 1917, received the Nobel prize in 1933), Aleksander Solzhenitsyn (deported from the Soviet Union in 1974, received the Nobel prize in 1970) and Joseph Brodsky (expelled from the Soviet Union in 1972, received the Nobel prize in 1987);
- Western authors of anti-Communist books, including Aldous Huxley, André Gide, André Breton, Arthur Koestler and George Orwell, André Malraux, John Dos Passos and Ignazio Silone;

[53] On the proposal of Lunacharski (the first 'narkom prosvesheniia'), each literary work written by a foreign author and published in the Soviet Union had to contain a special preface which explained the 'correct' meaning of the work to Soviet readers. This should be considered as a part of ideological pressure.

- Catholics: Georges Bernanos, Gilbert Keith Chesterton, Paul Claudel and Oscar Milosz, or mystics: Gustav Meyrink;
- Writers who were affiliated with the movement of the extreme right, regardless of the degree or nature of their involvement: Hans Carossa, Louis Céline, Ernst Junger, Giovanni Papini as well as Gottfried Benn, and Ezra Pound.
- Co-called "pornographic" writers i.e. D. H. Lawrence, Georges Bataille, and Henry Miller.

Henceforth, literature and the arts lost some of their public identification with civil society and gained a formal place in the official culture of the Soviet era. Writers[54] and artists had to accept the metamorphosis of public discourse itself and were forced to work under strong pressure from the Soviet communist regime.

Those authors who quickly adjusted to the regime's demands were highly praised by Soviet critics and newspapers. According to Jeffrey Brooks, the very first Soviet effort to canonize Soviet writers was Maxim Gorky's birthday celebration on 29 March 1928, which was planned when he agreed to return from Italy, as he did two months later. Commemorations of the deceased Soviet writers Dmitry Furmanov and Vladimir Mayakovski followed two years later. *Pravda* subsequently noted the 1933 anniversaries of the director Konstantin Stanislavski and the writer Alexander Serafimovich, both of whom were still alive.

There was no longer any way within the public discourse to represent (or even imagine) a writer who was not an enthusiastic supporter of the system without designating him/her a public enemy (Brooks 1994: 980–981). The union's organizer, P. Iudin, summed up this way of seeing the literary community in a speech printed on 4th September as a conclusion to the congress:

> Soviet writers affirm openly before all the world in their works, with their books and at their first congress that they are proponents of the communist world view, that they are firmly behind the positions of Soviet power and that they are ready to give their whole lives as active fighters for the triumph of socialism in the USSR, for the victory of the proletariat in the whole world (*Pravda* 9/4/34, qtd. in Brooks 1994: 981).

[54] Samuil Marshak, Burns's most famous tranlsator, was one of the first to adjust to the regime's demands.

The authority of non-professional commentators to discuss the arts became inherent in the limitless executive power of the Soviet system. Lenin, Trotsky, Bukharin and other leaders commented freely on artistic subjects, barely distinguishing their personal tastes and judgments from official pronouncements. This kind of intervention began with the Soviet era and was common nearly to the end of it, but the Stalin era was its golden age.

In addition to literature, visual representations of socialist realism are also apparent in many works of the time. A great deal of socialist realism portrayed both the fatherly figures of Lenin or Stalin, and representation of workers and agriculturalists, usually displaying an utopian interpretation of life. One example is the painting "Розы для Сталина" (*Flowers for Stalin*, 1949) by Boris Valdimirski, which pictures a group of children presenting bouquets of flowers to a fatherly-looking Stalin.

Similarly, this policy extended towards architecture as well. The Soviet Academy of Architecture was established in 1933. Architecture from the 1930s to 1950s was pragmatic and reflected the styles of classicism and constructivism. The main building of Moscow State University, completed in 1953, represents one of many architectural symbols of the epoch. In fact, Soviet sculpture had suffered similar fatal violence. Immediately after the Revolution, the regime worked out a special *Plan of Monumental Propaganda*, under which all statues to the tsars had to be demolished or taken down, with few exceptions. They were to be replaced by new monuments to the progressive leaders of all times, according to a special approved list. Strangely, some good monuments were erected in the first years of that pilot-project, such as the one to Timiryazev by Merkurov in Moscow. In general, Soviet sculpture aimed at glorifying party leaders in the basic forms of socialist realism. Only World War II monuments express the true emotions of their authors and express the grief and glory of the nation.

After the Revolution the foremost Russian artists were forced to emigrate. Those who, for various reasons, refused to leave the country had either to accept the communist dictatorship in art or to give up working. It took about ten years (1922–1932) for the final break down and to put an end to 'the art of the bourgeois past'. Every attempt to change the direction of the main trend was suppressed and the guilty artist rigorously prosecuted.

Censorship in the Soviet Union

From the first day of their rule, the Bolsheviks saw the free word as a moral threat to their power. Censorship in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics remains the longest lasting and most comprehensive censorship in the 20th century[55]. Arlen Blyum suggests that the very concept of censorship, seen as a method of regulation, does not approximately convey the meaning it acquired under totalitarian regimes, the Soviet regime in particular (2003: 1). The basis and main characteristics of censorship are not found in published laws, but in secret instructions issued by the ideological hierarchy and in the establishment of special institutions which controlled the execution of these instructions. In Blyum's opinion, censorship in such regimes involves phenomena of an entirely different order, of a very specific kind. The whole concept or restraint on freedom of speech in the Soviet Union includes not only censorship but also other methods of control established by the Party ideology (2003: 2–3). However, it is best to consider censorship in its basic meaning as the control by the state of the content, publication, and distribution of printed text. It is important to notice that in the last ten years Russian and foreign scholars have collected and analyzed a large number of previously secret documents which enables them to come to certain conclusions and to present a clear picture of ideological pressure. There were five official levels of censorship in the Soviet Union which were established to control all aspects of cultural life.

At the base of the censorship pyramid was self-censorship, which means an accommodation to particular regulations imposed either by the state, society, public or his or her own principles; this became the basic factor in the creative process. Inner censorship aimed at satisfying ideological demands can be regarded as a kind of self-defence mechanism that served to protect the author and to prevent him or her from conflict with regular censorship, which could be very dangerous. In totalitarian societies, most authors adapted to the existing circumstances; most Soviet authors did not

[55] Russia's long history of censorship has been well documented in numerous publications by both Russian and Western experts. However, the actual records of the vast number of books and newspapers that were subjected to strict censorship in Imperial Russia and the USSR are still only accessible in special collections, the Russian language manual catalogue card archive and printed lists deposited in the National Library of Russia in St. Petersburg (pre-revolutionary period) and the Russian State Library in Moscow (the USSR period).

have any other choice but to give up and to learn the 'rules of the game'. In the Soviet period self-censorship involved the author creating texts which were ideologically and politically acceptable to the official institutions of control. Hence, in certain cases, "the author attempts to uphold his or her creative freedom and realizing all possible consequences, contradicts the official rules and writes according to his or her own principles with no hope of appearing in print (for instance, Mikhail Bulgakov, Anna Akhmatova, Osip Mandel'stam and avant-garde poets)" (Blyum 2003: 6). However, from the 1930s self-censorship gradually became second nature to most authors which, of course, affected their work and led to deformation and loss of inspiration. Through constant self-censorship and fear, the author loses his originality and strains all his mental forces to get published at any price.

The next level was editorial censorship which was carried out by publishing houses, journals, newspapers, television and radio, theatre and cinema. The editors who formed a united filter with the censors against authors received instructions from the Party and edited texts to serve ideological purposes. They were more educated than censors and almost nothing could be concealed from them. The bulk of this work was accomplished by "creative unions" of writers, composers and artists, which controlled certain institutions and all their activities (publishing houses, theatrical performances and exhibitions)[56]. In such an environment 'reading between the lines', searching for hidden meaning, became an important part of the writing and reading process. Editors, as Yuri Triton observed, "filter ten times water that was already distilled".

In order to justify their existence and to demonstrate their cautiousness, preventing any suspicious text from being published, editors scrupulously examined every line. According to Vladimir Solodin, chief Soviet censor, editors' demands of any kind (additions, comments, erasure) had to be strictly followed. In his own words, he was trusted with tremendous power over the fate of books and the fate of authors, and the writers feared him (Richmond/Solodin 1997: 583). In the case of political or economical publications, it was easier to separate a harmful publication from a 'good' one, taking into account only ideological reasons. In the case of fiction, poetry, or art, it appeared to be much more difficult for censors to judge. The censors did a good job of offering the public well-selected information

[56] There were editors who attempted to protect the writers and resist ideological and political demands. Among them were A. K. Voronsky, the editor of the magazine *Krasnaya nov'* in the 1920s.

concerning the national cultural and historical heritage. There were some blank periods in pre-Revolutionary history, some cultural epochs were totally neglected, and some important names were crossed out for decades.

Considering this fact, it is difficult to talk about the authenticity of literary texts published in the Soviet Union. In most cases they represented products of collective, enforced cooperation between the author and the state.

It was in 1922 that the Soviet Government decided to institutionalize censorship "in order to achieve a more effective political supervision of mushrooming publications" (Ermolaev 1997: 3). A new censor body was called "Главное управление по делам литературы и издательства" (*The Main Administration for Literary and Publishing Affairs*), commonly known as *Glavlit* (the institute of state administration). Its stated purpose was "to unite all forms of censorship in printed works", which means that Glavlit had to carry out preliminary inspection of nearly all manuscripts and printed material, as well as photographs, drawings, and maps intended for publication and distribution[57] (Ermolaev 1997: 3). It had a right to allow (or prevent) the publication of any work and was subordinated to the Party.

Glavlit was to prevent any publications or distribution of works which: (1) contained propaganda against the Soviet regime, the Soviet Union, particular political bodies and figures (a censor had to be aware of the political platform of an author and his loyalty towards the Soviet Union and Communist Party); (2) divulged military secrets; (3) stirred up public opinion through false information; (4) aroused nationalist and religious fanaticism, propaganda of fascism, violence or terror; (5) were pornographic (qtd. in Ermolaev 1997: 3–4). Solodin also added that no works on macroeconomic and idealistic philosophy were allowed. Generally speaking, everything that did not fall under Socialist Realism was forbidden (1997: 585).

The central office had three departments[58]: the Department of Russian Literature, the Department of Foreign Literature, and the Administration and Control Department. The Department of Foreign Literature had two functions: control of importation of books and control of periodicals.

[57] Publications of the Communist Party, *Gosizdat* (state publishing house), the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, and scholarly writings of the Academy of Science were exempt from censorship.

[58] The power of *Glavlit* was enormous. In 1922 the Department of Russian Literature denied registration to sixteen publishing houses and twelve magazines in Moscow and Petrograd (Ermolaev: 1997, 5).

In addition, *Glavlit* controlled Russian publishers abroad, primarily in Europe. Of course, the culture of foreign countries could not be put under the control of Soviet censors. Complete isolation from foreign cultures was impossible, but limitation of access to foreign publications by housing them only in the major state libraries appeared to be very convenient. For that reason, foreign materials had to pass official censorship at the State Committee and were not permitted either in small local libraries or even in private book collections. Any publications from abroad were forbidden to private persons. Each attempt of that kind was suppressed by customs. Publications were confiscated even at the post office, except for diplomatic mailing. Access to original works of foreign art was strongly controlled by the state[59]. Travelling abroad was limited, and the behaviour of Soviet citizens while in foreign countries was controlled.[60] *Glavlit* played a key role, since it and its local agencies carried out all the practical work. According to Blyum, Glavlit occupied the middle place in the five-level pyramid of control. Below it were filters provided by authors and editors, above it the directives of the police and the Party, which had to be carried out rigorously (2003: 7–8). The end product of this system was to be a 'pure' text that conformed in every respect to the Party's ideological aims and demands.

Organs of the secret political police including the KGB (*Komitet gosudarstvennoi bezopasnosti*) and a Department of Political Control also performed an important censorial task. It is difficult to define the line dividing the spheres of activity of the organs of censorship and state security. Their primary task was to check published works for errors made by the regular personnel of *Glavlit* itself. The Agitprop Department (Department of Agitation and Propaganda) was a part of the Party Central Committee. The head of the Department was the Secretary for Ideology, who was, usually, the second man in the Party hierarchy. The Agitprop had the final say, determining the fate of authors and their works, as well as of publishing houses, journals, newspapers and other sources of information. It elaborated 'directives' (установки) which were carefully carried out by *Glavlit*.

Above the censorship pyramid stood the figure of the Party General Secretary, the head of the Soviet Union, who presented the final level and

[59] Strict limitation and censorship of the types of art objects to be displayed even in museums at both permanent and temporary exhibitions.

[60] Soviet citizens abroad were forbidden to meet or to talk to foreigners in private. A special KGB agent was always present at conversations, meetings or social occasions. It was forbidden to bring any foreign publications, including newspapers, journals or books to the Soviet Union.

whose verdict was beyond appeal (Blyum 2003: 8). The intervention of the General Secretary in the literary field was enormous during the dictatorship of Stalin. Hundreds of poets, writers and authors became his victims, including Bulgakov, Pasternak, Mandel'shtam and Platonov.

Even though the censorship pyramid was strictly divided, the whole process was not purely mechanical. In practice, the activities of the various institutions and instances were curiously intermeshed and it is impossible to draw a clear line between them.

Chapter Seven

Soviet Translations of Robert Burns

The new ideology imagined art as a vehicle for education or, alternatively, as an instrument of class war. Social realism became a powerful mechanism by which the leaders and supporters of the Stalinist system enlarged the domain of their moral and intellectual claims. Pressure on writers to sanction the official image of Soviet society increased, and it was clear that previous translations of Robert Burns from the nineteenth century could no longer fulfill the new aesthetic function of literature. New translations of Burns's poetry would have to follow the main ideological doctrines and include such features as a positive revolutionary hero, heroic acts, optimism, references to communist slogans, criticism of religion and so forth. In the nineteenth century most of Burns's love lyrics were translated, but his satires, his democratic lyric which contained appeals to the sentiments of freedom and citizenship, his patriotic songs and ironic epigrams remained unknown to Russian readers. However, if Burns was a relatively peripheral figure in the Tsarist nineteenth century, he subsequently achieved quite extraordinary cultural dominance in the Soviet Union.

The first translator who confronted the difficult task of adaptation of Burns's poems was Eduard Bagricky (1895–1934)[61] who successfully translated "John Barleycorn" and "The Jolly Beggars", adding some general patriotic and communist ideas. The main problem with Bagricky's translations was that he did not translate the originals but the nineteenth century translations of Mikhalov and Kozlov.

[61] Bagricky's translation of "John Barleycorn) is taken from: Robert Burns. 1928. [trans. Bagricky, Eduard]. *Jugo-zapad*. [South-West]. Moscow/Leningrad: 23.

Translating "John Barleycorn", Bagricky changed the original rhyme of the poem from *abcb* to *abab*. As the following examples show, Bagricky's translation is free,

But the cheerfu' spring came kindly on,
And show'rs began to fall;
John Barleycorn got up again,
And sore surprised them all
(Burns: 9–12)

Весенний дождь стучит в окно	*Spring rain knocks at the window*
В апрельском гуле гроз, –	*In the april noise of storms, –*
И Джон Ячменное Зерно	*And John Barlecorn*
Сквозь перегной пророс	*Grew throw muck.*
(Bagricky: 9–12)	

In Burns's original there is no mention of "april", "window", "noise" and "muck". The idea of John Barelycorn "grewing throw" the ground is, in fact, a successful interpretation as it stresses the idea of fighting and overcoming.

Burns uses a powerful metaphor in the following lines, "His head weel armed wi' pointed spears,/ That no one should him wrong" (Burns: 15–16). Bagricky decided to substitute "armed pointed spears" with a more peaceful equivalent. In his interpretation John's head is just "усатая" (moustached) and the line "no one should him wrong" is not translated at all. Thus, John's image becomes more human; however, the original powerful tone and the idea of John defending himself are gone. Translating "sober autumn" in the following lines,

The sober autumn entered mild,
When he grew wan and pale;
His bending joints and drooping head
Showed he began to fail
(Burns: 17–20)

Bagricky decided in favor of "stifling autmun" as "sober autumn" would not make much sense in the Russian context. He also decided to use an archaic word "занемог" (to become ill)

Но душной осени дано	*But stifling autumn*
Свой выполнить урок, –	*Must fulfill its task*

И Джон Ячменное Зерно	*And John Barleycorn*
От груза занемог	*Gets ill because of the weight.*
(Bagricky: 17–20)	

In the stanza which describes how John was tortured by his enemies, Bagricky again allowed himself several crucial substitutions.

They laid him down upon his back,
And cudgelled him full sore;
They hung him up before the storm,
And turned him o'er and o'er
(Burns: 29–32)

In Bagricky's translation John was beaten by chains and tramped by soles. The whole fourteenth stanza was not translated at all.

'Twill make a man forget his woe;
'Twill heighten all his joy:
'Twill make the widow's heart to sing,
Tho' the tear were in her eye
(Burns: 53–56)

Finally, at the end of Bagrciky's translation, Scotland is not mentioned, "And may his great posterity / Ne'er fail in old Scotland!" (Burns: 59–60).

The problem of the entire adaptation of Burns's poems according to the new regime remained unresolved for a couple of years. In 1934, the first book of translations was published in the Soviet Union but it included only pre-revolutionary translations.

In 1930, Tat'iana Shchepkina-Kupernik (1874–1952), an outstanding translator of Byron, Shakespeare and Lope de Vega, became interested in Burns. Kupernik, as one of the well-known Russian translators of European authors, based her credo on three principles of creative translation, very close to modern translation theory: (1) each translation should be considered a valuable contribution to Russian culture; (2) each translation is, in the first place, made for common readers, and not for highly educated scholars, so it should be accurate, but at the same time it should reproduce the meaning of the source text as exactly as possible in a way that is readily comprehensible to the intended audience and (3) in order to translate properly, the translator must have a perfect command of the language of the original, which does not mean simply understanding the words, but "feeling the spirit of the language and the original style of writing" (qtd. in Orlov 1972: 102).

Following her theory, Kupernik always attempted to reproduce the original artistic images in another language so that the reader of the translation could be inspired, moved and aesthetically entertained in the same way the native reader was by the original. Such a translation was not purely a technical transfer from one language into another, but required that the translator duplicated the author's process of artistic creation, grasped the spirit of the original, found the most appropriate expression of his own thought, feeling and experience, and reproduced as correctly as possible the content and form of the original in a literary language comparable to the original.

To achieve this, the translator must be gifted in literary writing. Kupernik also insisted on the exact expression of the meaning; the form was of secondary importance. In her articles devoted to Shakespeare, she stressed that expressing the *idea* of the author was of utmost importance for the translator, which was only possible if the translator understood the spirit of the language and could successfully reproduce the style of the author. Considering spirit and style to be completely different fields, Kupernik defines language as an extensive conception which includes vocabulary and grammar, whereas style is described as a choice of words and expressions and their position as a reflection of the author's mind (qtd. in Orlov 1972: 110). According to Kupernik, the dynamics and laconism of the English language in comparison with Russian presented the main challenge for Russian translators.

In 1936, Kupernik prepared a book of Burns's lyric poems which included translations of seventy-four poems and became the largest collection of Burns's Russian translations by one author. The translator presented different genres – political, satires, love lyrics, songs and ballads – as well as poems which had never been introduced to Russian readers before, for example "Holy Willie's Prayer" and "A Poet's Welcome to his Love-begotten Daughter.

There are two principal observations that should be made concerning Kupernik's treatment of Burns's poetry: (1) Kupernik, like Burns, does not sentimentalize; her translations remain perfectly true to the colloquial tone and spirit of the original. (2) Kupernik Russifies themes, settings and vernacular out of consideration for a Russian audience.

Kupernik's adaptations were praised by Mikhail Gutner, a famous Soviet critic, who emphasized the successful interpretation of Burns's revolution-

ary and democratic ideas. Kupernik's greatest achievement was considered to be her understanding of Burns's national spirit and her ability to comprehend and appreciate his optimism and faith in the poor, "She was able to transfer his passionate love for life, his hatred towards hypocrisy and violence, his courage and his faith into the great future of workers" (Orlov 1972: 119).

Kupernik's translations of patriotic lyrics were also acknowledged to be successful. However, they were overwhelmed by typical clichés of patriotic lyrics and songs of the Soviet period in order to stress Burns's patriotic spirit and love for the motherland (the most patriotic poem was considered to be "My Heart's in the Highlands").

Using different translation strategies, Kupernik followed the main ideological demands enforced by communist doctrine. Generally speaking, she succeeded in transferring the democratic, cheerful and folk style of Burns's lyrics. The idea of a 'national' poet revealed by Kupernik corresponded to the newly established literary role and allowed Soviet critics to interpret Burns as an orator of the Scottish people, a poet of workers and peasants, a democrat and revolutionary whose spirit remained unconquered despite historical repression.

Speaking about positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, described by van Dijk in his categorization of linguistic strategies as a means of stressing ideological connotations, it must be noted that Kupernik presented a clear delineation into 'friends' and 'enemies' in her translations. Selecting the general characteristics of this division, we notice that the category of friends occupies a prominent position, while the 'enemies' are often marginalized, underestimated, or simply deleted. To the category of 'friends' belong common workers, peasants, sailors, soldiers and blacksmiths, who are optimistic, cheerful, honest and courageous, and whose position and ideals are emphasized and hyperbolized in Kupernik's translations. Scottish national heroes are also considered as 'friends', even though their struggle for Scotland is often interpreted as a struggle for international causes. For that reason, Scotland is often deleted or generalized in Kupernik's translations. Kupernik used typical Russian dialect expressions and stylizations of everyday speech in order to express the colourful world of 'common workers'[62], full of simple happiness, hope, courage and the struggle for equal rights (e.g. "Is there for Honest Poverty", "John

[62] Such an interpretation suited Soviet ideological rhetoric and was very close to the main communist slogan: 'Let's struggle for peace and union of the workers all over the world'.

Anderson, My Jo" "Pegasus and Wanlockhead", "Willie Brew'd a Peck o' Maut" and "On the Saes and Far Away").

Priests, monarchs, politicians, both British and Scottish, and aristocrats (even those who were among the poet's friends) belonged to the category of 'standard enemies'. In this case Kupernik used a sarcastic, derogatory and often highly humiliating diction[63], far exceeding that of the original poems.

The Twa Dogs by Shchepkina-Kupernik

Kupernik's[64] ideological intentions are clear in the poem "The Twa Dogs". Literary historians tend to classify "The Twa Dogs" as a tale, a satire in the beast-fable convention; some of them even see it as deriving from Cervantes' *Colloquy to the Do*gs, an English translation of which appeared in 1767 (Crawford 1960: 169). It has to be noted that the numerous references to Thomson, Ramsay, Fergusson, Swift, Milton and Shakespeare disappear in Kupernik's translation because of the general trend towards the domestication method.

The poem is organized in the form of a dialogue between two dogs, Caesar and Luath, who are good friends in spite of the fact that one of them belongs to a lord and the other to a ploughman. The fundamental idea of their statements is the division of society into classes and its effect upon the quality of individual life. The central theme of the poem appears to be the claim that virtue does not depend on wealth and that peasants can be even better men than the gentry, even though they are well aware of their miserable position. According to Crawford, considering the fact that the convictions that Burns expresses in "The Twa Dogs" reflect the interests of rural democracy as conceived by small farmers and agricultural labourers in Scotland in the 1780s, the poem possesses a certain documentary merit

[63] Such images were frequent in Burns's poetry and built a gallery of satiric antiheroes. The interpretation of Burns as a poet of political satire was a very important part of his image as created in the Soviet Union.

[64] All Kupernik's translations quoted in this chapter are taken from: Robert Burns: 1936 [trans. Shchepkina-Kupernik, Tat'iana.]: *Izbrannaia Lirika* [Chosen Lyrics]. Moscow: Molodaia Gvardiia.

(1960: 173). However, considering the new ideological program, the main value of the poem was supposed to be a strict delineation between social classes. There are no significant changes in the content. The differences, instead, lie in the intentional intensifying of ideologically favourable elements such as enforced social differences, and the deemphasizing of the ideologically questionable elements such as references to religious context. Little wonder that the translation ascribes moral superiority to the lower class, disturbing the balance that Burns achieves.

The first significant change appears in the translation of Caesar's (the lord's dog) first stanza in which he asks about the conditions of his friend's (Luath) life. Following the main ideological demands, Kupernik used the strategy of substitution with a negative emphasis. One of the main domains in Soviet ideological discourse was criticism of capitalist countries where the life of workers and peasant was supposed to be terrible, while Soviet people, of course, were allowed to live in paradise on Earth. As Scotland was also a capitalist country, it was important to illustrate the miserable living conditions of the Scottish peasantry. For that reason, the translator intentionally intensified the poor living conditions, choosing more negative substitutions than in the original. Thus, Caesar's question about Luath's master's life, "What way poor bodies liv'd ava" (Burns: 50), was translated "И как живут средь нищеты" / how is it to live in *destitution*. The word "нищета" (destitution, extreme poverty) has a stronger negative connotation than "poor bodies" which do not necessarily refer to poor living conditions, at least not as intensely as in Kupernik's translation.

Kupernik uses the word "destitution" in combination with the archaic word "средь" (among/in), moving the conversation between the dogs away from colloquial speech and emphasizing the seriousness of this statement. The reference to the "gentry's life" is not translated, presumably so as not to disturb the main idea of concentration on "poor bodies". The expression "poor dogs" used by Caesar in the same stanza is translated literally as "бедные псы". The Russian word "пёс" (a dog, a hound) might acquire a negative connotation in certain context to describe a dishonest, cruel person. However, it could have been chosen merely for the sake of the rhyme. In general, in Kupernik's translation Caesar is introduced in a more negative light than in the original. He is not only curious but almost sarcastic, asking his friend how it feels to live in destitution, while in the original Caesar has no idea about how his friend lives and shows no intention of hurting his feelings.

I've often wonder'd, honest Luath,
What sort o life **poor dogs** like you have;
An when the gentry's life I saw,
What way **poor bodies** liv'd ava *at all*
(Burns: 47–40)

Люаф почтеный я не раз *Honest Luath, I have often wondered*
Дивился: что за жизнь у вас *What kind of life*
У **бедных псов** таких как ты ***Poor dogs** like you have*
И как живут средь **нищеты**? *And how is it to live in **destitution**?*
(Kupernik: 49–52)

The domesticated strategy is successfully combined with the strategy of negative emphasis in the translation of the line "L_ _d man, our gentry care sae little,/For delvers, ditchers, and sic cattle" (Burns: 89–90). In order to stress the negative attitude of the gentry towards peasants and workers, Kupernik invents the word "холоп" (kholop), which does not exist in the original and describes feudally dependent people in Russia between the tenth and early eighteenth centuries. Their legal status was close to that of slaves. The word "gentry" was substituted with a more Russian term "дворянство" (nobles). In this case Kupernik is persistent in domesticating the whole stanza by using two typically Russian terms.

L_ _d man, our gentry care sae little,
For delvers, ditchers, and sic cattle.
(Burns: 89–90)

Дворянство видит скот в **холопах**, ***Nobles** consider their **'kholops'**,*
Чернорабочих, землякопах. *Delvers and ditchers as cattle.*
(Kupernik: 91–92)

The same strategy of domestication appears in the translation of the expression "cot-folk" (Burns: 69) which was translated "мужик" (muzhik). In this case, the word "мужик", with a degree of typical Russian colloquialism attached, contains a reference to a male with particular emphasis on low social status. The reader would instinctively associate "мужик" with extremely poor living conditions. Again, it attributes a greater degree of disrespect to the part of Caesar, something which is not present in the original.

In what follows, Caesar satirically criticises the privileged life of his owners, "He rises when he likes himsel;/His flunkies answer at the bell"

(Burns: 53–54). Kupernik decided to use another typically Russian term "lakie" instead of "flunky".

Встаёт когда он сам захочет.	*He gets up when he wishes.*
Чуть позвонит, лакей подскочит.	*He just calls and the* ***lakei*** *runs up.*
(Kupernik: 69–70)	

It is interesting that Kupernik decided in favour of the word "лакей" to translate "flunky", even though there is an equivalent in the Russian language, the word "слуга", which literally means servant. A short history of the term "лакей" may explain this translation choice. The term was used to describe a male employed as a high-ranking servant responsible for running various errands in upper class households. However, in the new, post-revolutionary context, it acquired a humiliating meaning, a "lick-spittle", someone who served aristocrats before the revolution. Thus, with reference to "lakei", Kupernik used a more insulting term than in the original.

There are more examples of domestication with negative connotations in Kupernik's translation. Thus, in the line "In favor wi' some gentle master" (Burns: 145), "gentle master" is translated by Kupernik as "помещик" (pomeshchik), another archaic Russian word which describes a holder of land on service tenure. After the October revolution, 'pomeshchiks' property *was confiscated by the state and the word acquired a negative meaning, someone who exploited the poor before the revolution.*

The expression "Hech, man" (Burns: 171), used by Luath to express his disbelief and surprise is translated "ох, батюшки" (o, my father). In Russian, this colloquial phrase has nothing to do with someone's father but is used to express fear or astonishment. In fact, this substitution is successful because by rendering the expression in Russian colloquial speech, Kupernik ascribes a greater degree of simplicity and directness to Luath's statement.

In the translation of the following lines, describing social and economic oppression,

How they maun thole a factor's snash;
He'll stamp an threaten, curse an swear
He'll apprehend them, poind their gear;
While they maun stan, wi aspect humble,
An hear it a', an fear an tremble!
(Burns: 96–100)

Kupernik uses the expression “грозиться снять последний крест” / He threatens to take the last cross away (97). This refers to the orthodox tradition of wearing a cross around the neck. As the most sacred symbol given to a person after baptism, the cross was the last thing that could be taken away; the threat to do so meant that a person did not have anything else to give. This reference to religious tradition shows that in the 1930s ideological demands were looser and much less clearly defined. In Marshak’s translations, almost all allusions to the Bible, religion or ceremonies were ignored.

Another religious reference at the beginning of the poem, “lords of the creation” (Burns: 46), is replaced with “венец творенья” (garland of creation). In this case the substitution is not as successful as the previous one because “венец творенья” is a common epithet in Russian poetry and sounds out of place in the prologue to the satirically coloured friendly conversation. In the Bible, man is referred to as the garland of creation. However, the reference is not obvious and requires a good knowledge of biblical context to be interpreted.

The strategy of deletion, which means that the source text item is not rendered in the target text at all, can be seen alongside the strategy of substitution in the examples in which the word “Lord” appears, and also in the meaning of the word ‘God’. Both dogs also use this word quite often to express their astonishment or disbelief. It is possible that intentional deletion or substitution of the word was supposed to satisfy Soviet censors, even though it is clear from the previous examples that Kupernik did not erase religious context completely.

Thus, the phrase “L_ _d, man” (Burns: 88), used to illustrate Caesar’s astonishment, was simply deleted. The same thing happened to Luath’s phrase “guid faith” (Burns: 159) which is replaced by a rather unceremonious, colloquial expression “ей, брось” (hej, no way). The phrase “L_ _d, man” used in line 189 is translated with a typical communist slogan “ох, брат” (oh, brother), erasing an ironic response on the part of Caesar which is obvious in the original. In fact, throughout the poem Kupernik intentionally strives to stress the equality of both interlocutors, whereas in the original Luath is more respectful and naïve than Caesar, who is well aware of the political situation and patronizes his friend. In the Soviet translation the equality of the dogs is intended to reflect the equality of both social classes. When Luath addresses Caesar as “Master Caesar” in the 185th line, Kupernik deletes the word “master”, leaving only “Caesar”. On the other

hand, when Caesar addresses Luath "honest Luath" (Burns: 46), Kupernik used the word "почтенный" (highly honourable*)* instead, an archaic expression meant to stress the equality of both interlocutors.

When translating the word "priest" (Burns: 119), Kupernik again uses the strategy of substitution with negative emphasis. "Priest" is translated as "поп", an archaic word which has satirical and sometimes even contemptuous connotations in modern Russian. Another example of domestication occurs in the same line. Kupernik uses a phraseological expression "в пух и прах", which means entirely, so intense that it makes the fur fly.

The strategy of substitution with de-emphasis appears in the translation of the phrase "great folk's life's a life o' pleasure" (Burns: 186) which is translated "жизнь богачей весьма приятна" / The life of rich people is quite pleasing. The word "pleasure", used to describe the unquestionable priorities of the gentry's life, is replaced by the expression "весьма приятно" (quite pleasing) which deemphasizes the original idea.

But will ye tell me, Master Caesar?	
Sure great folk's life's a **life o pleasure**	
(Burns: 185–186)	
За то уж Цезарь, вероятно	*Well, Caesar, perhaps*
Жизнь богачей **весьма приятна**	*The life of rich is* ***quite pleasing****.*
(Kupernik: 184–185)	

The strategy of diminution is also used in this case. The "great folk" is translated as "богачи", an expression with a humiliating meaning often used by Soviet authorities to describe wealthy people.

The same strategy is used in the next line, which describes Caesar as a friendly and honest dog despite his belonging to the higher social level. The phrase "but though he was o' high degree" (Burns: 15) is translated "но хоть породой вроде лорда" / Despite his breed which is close to the lord's. The word "порода" might be applied to describe a person's character but it is also used in the meaning of "breed". Therefore, used next to the word "lord", the word "порода" adds a humiliating touch.

The strategy of generalization is used in the translation of the line "for Britain's guide!"(149) in which "Britain" is replaced by "родина" (homeland). Kupernik's intention in this case is to accommodate Burns's original to the situation in the Soviet Union, promoting him as an international rather than

exclusively Scottish poet. The same generalization occurs in the phrase "he was nane of Scotland's dogs" (10) in which Kupernik deletes Scotland and explains that the dog was originally "из чужих сторон" (from foreign countries).

The strategy of softening, often used in Kupernik's translations of love lyrics, appears in the translation of Caesar's lines in which he mentions "Wh_re-hunting amang groves o myrtles" (Burns: 164). Shchepkina Kupernik used the old-fashioned expression "девок непотребных" (167) instead of "whore-hunting". The expression literally means "prostitutes" but is rather archaic and used only in literature.

The strategy of softening is also used in Shchepkina-Kupernik's translation of the last stanza, "Ae night, they're mad wi drink an wh_ring" (Burns: 217) in which she uses the word "разврат" (immorality) instead of "whoring".

The Cotter's Saturday Night

The next poem included in the current analysis is "The Cotter's Saturday Night", which reflects Burns's sentimental manner, and also serves as a good example of the ideological influence on translation. According to Crawford, the poem has long been despised because of its sentimental rhetoric and English diction. Moreover, in this poem Burns exchanged his favorite verse form for the complicated Spenserian stanza which he did not handle well (Crawford 1960: 174). The poem is difficult to comprehend because of the numerous echoes from older poets and familiar associations. Crawford (1960: 175–176) describes allusions to Gray, Goldsmith, Fergusson, Shenstone, Pope, Thomson, Gay, Milton, Collins, Young, Stern and Shakespeare, assuming that the use of allusion and echoes are a consequence of the social nature of Burns's poetry. He was never interested in creating a private language but rather in making his own selection from words, phrases and idioms used in other discourses. However, the result of this method was probably more accessible to Burns's contemporary readers, whereas there are few today who can recognize allusions to Milton or Elliot without additional explanations. The poem was responsible for

popularizing the exemplary image of the Scottish poor, demonstrating the moral superiority of cottage life (Sampson 1984: 19–20). Its style is clearly English.

The most striking instance of Kupernik's reshaping and expanding in order to lay heavier stress on the positive representation of the lower class results in the prevalence of the strategy of deletion, which allowed Kupernik to avoid numerous intertextual references to the Gospel in the first place. Thus, line 173, "For whom my warmest wish to Heaven is sent" was completely deleted because of the word "heaven", as well as lines 127 to 144 (the fifteenth and sixteenth stanzas) which describe a family's prayers and include the names of Jesus, Babylon, the Eternal King, Patmos, Christian, the Creator, Heaven, and other allusions to the Bible. For the same purpose the strategy of substitution was used, aimed at the obliteration of Biblical allusions. The expression "His Book of Life" (153) was replaced by "великий список" (a great list). In the fourteenth stanza, the name Moses was erased and King David was replaced by "царь-певец" (the king-singer). These deletions and substitutions brought about a drastic change in the comprehension of the poem, which in the original proclaimed the beauty and sincerity of true faith in comparison with the constrained demands of the church. In Kupernik's translation this meaning was almost completely lost.

As we have already seen in the examples of "The Twa Dogs", one of the main strategies used by Kupernik is the softening of erotic or any "immoral" context in Burns's originals, yet she goes as far as erasing even the most innocent references. Thus, reference to "love sparkling" (Burns: 33) in the eyes of the cotter's daughter Jenny was deleted.

The strategy of deletion also appears in the last stanza, devoted to the patriotic appeal to Scotland, which was not translated at all.

The strategy of substitution with negative emphasis was used to intensify the negative connotations of the luxurious life of the nobles, which appear to be more offensive than in the original. In the lines 176–177, "And O! May Heaven their simple lives prevent /From luxury's contagion, weak and vile!", the expression "luxury contagion" was translated "яд роскоши" (poison of luxury), "weak" as "заразы тленье"(infection of decay), and "vile" as "пороков извращенье" (muck of disgusting sins).

And O! May Heaven their simple lives prevent
From **luxury's contagion**, **weak** and **vile**!
(Burns: 176–177)

Да не коснётся их **заразы тленье**,
Яд роскоши, пороков
гнусных гной
(Kupernik: 159–160)

*May the **infection of decay,***
***The poison of luxury** and*
***The muck of disgusting sins** never touch them.*

The last stanza, which contains references to "Wallace' heart", "the Patriot's God", "Scotia's realm" and "Patriot bard", was deleted.

In the case of cultural items, Kupernik used the strategy of limited universalization (replacement by a reference that still belongs to the source language culture but is closer to the target readers). Thus, the word "parritch" (Scots vernacular expression for "porridge") was translated as "каша", a typical Russian dish which is close to porridge. The strategy of absolute universalization (erasing of any foreign connotation in a reference) was used in the translation of the word "soup", which was translated as "похлёбка", a typical Russian expression for a light soup, usually cooked without meat. Unfortunately, the vivid impression of colloquial speech achieved by the use of Scottish intonation was completely lost in the translation.

Other translations of Shchepkina-Kupernik

In the political satire "Lines to a Gentleman. To a Gentleman who had sent him a News-Paper, and offered to continue it free of expense", Kupernik used the strategies of deletion and substitution in dealing with the word "Sir", which could never be used by a communist poet. The addressee referred to as "kind Sir" in the very first line was deleted because Burns could not address anyone above him with such respect, even if this respect was expressed ironically in order to create a satirical note at the very beginning of the poem. The word "Sir" in the third line was replaced by "чародей" (a magician). The strategy of softening (or probably just a misunderstanding) is obvious in the eighth line, "If Venus yet had got his nose off", a gentle hint at the emperor Franz Joseph's venereal disease, which was translated "венере в нос добычу бросив" / He throws his win before Venera's nose.

Kupernik adds a more pathetic tone to the translation of the poem "To the Guidwife of Wauchope House" in which Burns says,

No nation, no station
My envy e'er could raise:
A scot still but blot still
I knew nae higher praise
(Burns: 61–64).

Не знаю, не желаю	*I don't know and don't wish*
Я радости иной.	*Another happiness rather than*
Быть сыном гражданином	*Being **a son** and a **citizen***
Шотландии родной	*Of my Scotland.*
(Kupernik: 26–29)	

At the beginning of the poem, Burns also says "When first amang the yellow corn / A man I reckon'd was" (7–8). In order to soften what is obvious in the original, Kupernik translates "Я стал мужчиной" (8) / I became a man, erasing the reference to the exact place Burns became a man. Thus, Kupernik's translation hints at a more abstract issue of general maturity and not to the exact circumstanses mentioned in the original. There is an obvious misunderstanding of the original in the translation of the lines "An' with the lave ilk merry morn / Could rank my rig and lass" (Burns: 9–10). The word "rig" clearly refers to the ridge on the fields; however, Kupernik does not translate the word directly but uses a diminutive of another word "полоска" (line or strip on the material) instead. Readers would never associate the Russian word with the field as it is never used in this context; they would imagine instead that Burns had striped clothes, which is completely out of context.

In general, Kupernik's translation is more sentimental than the original. For instance, translating the lines, "So tiched, bewitched, I rav'd ay to mysel" (Burns: 40–41), Kupernik used the adjectives "зажженный, вдохновленный" (enlightened and inspired) instead of "tiched, bewitched".

Working within the ideological boundaries that were imposed upon her as a translator, Kupernik had to avoid any frivolous expressions and hints at sexual relationships, so common in Burns's lyrics, replacing them with innocent kisses and 'comradely' hugs. It has been already pointed out that eroticism in literature and art was suppressed by Soviet censorship. The intentional sentimentality of Kupernik's translations prevents Soviet readers from comprehending the lively, colourful, humorous style of Burns's songs.

Critics insisted on the importance of his style, which was considered to be simple and laconic. In their opinion, Kupernik used too many sentimental epithets, characteristic of the 'decayed', decadent poetry of the nineteenth century. Critics were very sensitive to the natural style of Burns's poems, and each inaccuracy or overly 'bookish' expression, which would otherwise be perfectly acceptable in translation, was considered to be an 'inadmissible falsehood'.

For instance, in the poem "A Red, Red Rose" Kupernik used the word "неземной" (celestial) translating the word "sweet" in the line "That's sweetly play'd in tune" (Burns: 4). This word distorts the simplicity and shifts Burns' lyric towards the artificial intonations of mystic poetry. In the last stanza of the same poem the translator used the expressions "свет мой единый"(my only light), instead of simply "my only Luve" and "прости же" (forgive me) instead of "fare thee weel".

In translating the poem "Farewell to Eliza", Kupernik used the strategy of addition (invention) when the target text turns out to contain linguistic, cultural or textual component features which have no apparent antecedent in the source text (Delabastita 1993: 36). She invented the phrases "Элайза, друг мой нежный" (1) (Eliza, my tender friend) as well as "друг сердечный" (9) (the friend of my heart) in order to erase any hint of a romantic relationship between the poet and Eliza. The eighth line "My heart and soul from thee", was translated as "моей души с тобой" (my soul with thee), omitting the word "heart". In fact, the translation creates the impression that the lines could have been dedicated to Burns's sister or perhaps to his best friend.

The translation of the poem "The Gowden Locks of Anna" was equipped with numerous clichés of sentimental lyric, aimed at softening the original's passion and desire. The strategy of softening is obvious in the phrase "Thus within my straining grasp/ The melting form of Anna" (Burns: 11–12), where the word "form" was replaced by the word "стан", a poetic expression for the female figure, and instead of the word "grasp" the word "объятия" (embracing) was used.

Thus within my straining **grasp**
The melting form of Anna
(Burns: 11–12)

В моих **объятиях** до зари	*Shall the light **'stan'** of Anna*
Пусть тает **стан** воздушный Анны	*Melt in my **embracing** until the dawn.*
(Kupernik: 11–12)	

The phrase "Yestreen I had a pint o' wine" (1) was translated "вчера я осушил бокал"/ yesterday I drained my goblet. The word "lips" (8) was translated as "уста", a poetic expression for lips. The phrase "Awa, thou pale Diana!"(18) was translated "Диана, скрой свой лик туманный" / Diana, hide your misty image. In general, the frivolous poem was overwhelmed by poetic, sentimental expressions.

The translation of "To a Mountain Daisy" was acknowledged to be Kupernik's most unsuccessful, and Soviet critics, who otherwise praised her ingenuity and poetic gifts, called it 'exaggerated sentimentality'. In the first part, Kupernik used numerous diminutives to express the pastoral-idyllic style and sentimentality of the poem, "цветочек" (a diminutive of *flower*), "стебелёк" (a diminutive of *stem*), "глазок" (a diminutive of *eye*), "камушек" (a diminutive of *stone*) and "уголок" (a diminutive of *corner*). In the second part, she decided to emphasize the high morality of the poem by comparing "an artless maid" (31) with the flower of saintly innocence and purity instead of simply "sweet flower" (32) and using expressions typical of an elegy, such as "участь", a poetic word for destiny and "во прах растоптан" (crushed/trampled into ashes) instead of "laid low i' the dust" (Burns: 35–36).

Such is the fate of artless maid,
Sweet flow'ret of the rural shade!
By love's simplicity betray'd,
And guileless trust;
Till she, like thee, all soil'd, is laid
Low i' the dust
(Burns: 31–36)

Вот участь девушки простой,	*This is the fait of a simple maid,*
Село пленявшей красотой	*Who charmed the village with her beauty.*
Цветка невинности святой	*The flower of saint innocence*
И чистоты:	*And purity:*
Во прах растоптана судьбой	*She is trampled into ashes by destiny*
Она, как ты!	*Like you!*
(Kupernik: 31–36)	

However, some Soviet critics were dissatisfied with the use of archaic expressions that were perfectly comprehensible for Russian readers. Thus, in the poem "Whistle and I Will Come to You My Lad", from which Kupernik translated only the first and second stanza, the expression used in the 3rd line "Tho' father an' mother" was translated "батюшка и матушка", old-fashioned, pre-revolutionary expressions for *father and mother*. By using this phrase Kupernik was accused of appreciating pre-revolutionary norms and values. Marshak, who became the most famous Russian translator of Burns's poetry, carefully avoided this mistake and never used archaic words in his translations. Translating the same phrase in the poem "Whistle and I Will Come to You My Lad", he used the literal translation "отец и мать" (father and mother).

There are some examples of obvious changing of the original by Kupernik, as in the poem "I Hae a Wife o' My Ain",

If naebody care for me
I'll care for naebody
(Burns: 15–16)

Не любим я никем-не беда,
Я и сам не люблю никого
(Kupernik: 15–16)

Noone loves me – but this is not a disaster
I don't love anyone either.

In the translation of the poem "A Merry Widower", Kupernik used the word "мавзолей" (mausoleum) in translating the line "Her body is bestowed well/A handsome grave does hide her". Considering that the poem was supposed to reflect the feelings of a simple peasant, the word "mausoleum" appears rather odd and out of place. The translation also does not transfer the original humorous effect of the word "handsome" applied to describe the grave of a woman.

Humorous effect was also lost in the poem "How Cruel are the Parents" which was almost transformed into a sonnet, glorifying women's poor destiny and filled with expressions usually used in high, pompous literary language such as "увы" (*alas*), "чтить" (*to estimate*), "реет" (a very rare expression which means "*to fly*", used primarily in Romantic poetry describing a bird as a symbol of freedom) and "трепетный" (*tender*).

The strategy of softening may be also observed in the poem "Holy Willie's Prayer". The phrase "When from my mither's womb I fell" (Burns:

19) was translated “едва открыл я детский взгляд” / As soon as I opened my childlike eyes.,

Even though Shchepkina-Kupernik’s translations were positively accepted, critics could not forget that she belonged to the pre-revolutionary circle of authors, and could not be completely trusted with such an important task as preparing Robert Burns’s poems for the comprehension of Soviet readers.

It is obvious that at first the translations of Shchepkina-Kupernik were accepted by critics, but later came to be considered as unsuccessful. She did not succeed in presenting Burns as a democratic communist poet, as was demanded. The problem was that her translations were made in the period when the norms and rules for the ‘canonization’ of foreign authors who could be presented to Russian readers had not yet been clearly defined. An approximate schema of the ideological-aesthetic choice of literary works and their interpretation according to the ideas of the communist regime appeared later. This schema included translations, comments, analysis and other instruments for presenting foreign classics to Russian readers.

Thanks to Shchepkina-Kupernik’s translations, the popularity of Burns peaked in 1930 when the concept of ‘progressive culture’ in a new Soviet, democratic society was finally defined. Soviet critics had no further doubts about Robert Burns– he was called ‘a great progressive poet of the revolution’ and the process of his canonization in the Soviet Union continued rapidly. Burns was taken up by the leading Soviet critics, and in a matter of years became one of the most famous European poets in the Soviet Union. However, the true nature of his poetic gift was so misinterpreted that much has still to be done in modern Russia to explore his poetic heritage free from earlier ideological intervention.

The new conception of Burns’s poetry as revolutionary and purely communist remained unchanged for more than seventy years during the communist regime. It all started with the first publication of *Литературная газета*[65] (a new Soviet literary newspaper) (1938) in which Burns’s poetry was pronounced to be ‘useful’ for a new social culture, outweighing any of the poetic qualities of his work. It was particularly emphasized that Burns wrote of rural peoples’ struggle and the renewing power of the national liberal movement in Scotland. Soviet governments also cultivated a sense of deep devotion to the State, with citizens being encouraged to regard the State as being almost like a parent. This aspect perfectly corresponded

[65] Literaturnaia gazeta [Literary Newspaper]

to Burns's patriotic poetry. However, Soviet critics discovered that, while Shchepkina-Kupernik's translations were the first made in post-revolutionary Russia, they only weakly conveyed Burns's revolutionary spirit. For that reason, new translations would soon appear to situate Burns in the evolving ideological system and to make him acceptable to a new audience.

The authority of subordinated, usually non-professional, commentators to discuss the arts was inherent in the limitless executive power of the Soviet system. Within the totalitarian ideology, literary criticism became one of the means of manipulating reality and forcing it to conform to the idea. Indeed, whereas all ideologies tend to present the logic of an idea as scientific, totalitarian ideology was unique in the sense that it ignored reality. Among other issues, Soviet critics advocated the use of biographies as a means of ideological adaptation. For that reason, it was especially important to present Burns's biography in a way that was necessary for its 'proper' interpretation.

Thus, Mikhail Gutner, a famous Soviet critic, wrote an article about Burns' life entitled "Роберт Бернс" (Robert Burns) which was published in *Литературная газета* (1938: 5–10). His partly biographical, partly critical sketch was supposed to establish the main points of a new interpretation of Burns's poetry and also to stress and explain those features that would be useful for a new Soviet ideology. One of the most important factors in explaining the 'proletarian spirit' of certain authors, regardless of their poetic talent, was their background. Great writers had to emerge from the most revolutionary class, the working class. Gutner drew the attention of the readers to the fact that Burns was born into the poor family of a common farmer, which had nothing to do with the aristocratic circles strongly criticized in Soviet literature. He also reminded Soviet readers that the main reasons Burns could not assert himself successfully as a poet in England were his sympathies for the French Revolution and his open protest against English aristocrats. To stress Burns's connection with the poor and with revolutionary circles, Gutner allowed himself to add some invented "facts" to his biography. For example, he asserted that Burns first gave his poems to his countrymen, who were impressed and dismayed by his brevity. In fact, no dates exist which confirm that Burns really did give his poems to his countrymen. Moreover, ignoring the fact that Burns's first poems were devoted to his girlfriend ("Handsome Nell"), Gutner made another interesting addition: that Burns started his poetic career with satires on the church and the priests. As soon as Soviet ideology rejected any

kind of religion and church as an independent institution, it was important for Soviet critics to present Burns as anti-Christian. Gunter observed that Burns considered priests 'brothers of bourgeois exploiters'. As an example of an anti-Christian poem, he mentioned "Holly Willie's Prayer", a satirical poem free of any ideological grounds.

On the other hand, Gutner used "For a' That and a' That" and "Love and Liberty" as examples of Burns's democratic spirit and his connection with peasants, workers and beggars, showing how much Burns was concerned about the poor and how he dreamed about democracy and equal rights.

Burns's new role required further induction and transformations. The first poems translated by Samuil Marshak were published in the *Молодая гвардия*[66] (a new Soviet newspaper) alongside an article by Alexander Anikst, an expert in English literature. Anikst again stressed the origins which brought Burns so close to commoners. Central to his understanding of Burns' role as a national poet became Burns sympathy with the French revolution which he was supposed to have participated in on French land. This is a very interesting claim indeed, considering that Burns never left Scotland. Anikst mentioned the Scottish circle of those who approved and supported French revolutionaries and the head of this circle was supposed to be Burns (again a completely fabricated claim).

Placing Burns among the most progressive strugglers for democratic rights, Anikst emphasized his important role in the development of English literature – which is partly true. However, his statement that Burns should be considered one of the very few truly progressive English poets seems exaggerated, as Burns did not bring about any drastic changes in the development of English literature. He found his own unique place and brought something new with his poetry, but he did not influence the forms and themes dominant in later English literature.

A complete misinterpretation of Burns's connections to folklore resulted in one more interesting conclusion: that Burns's poetry actually grew out of folklore. Burns used materials from folk songs and imitated their form and spirit, but his poetry cannot be compared with folk poetry as he simply used parts of it for his purposes.

Shifting the focus of his analysis from Burns's poetic achievements to his social status, Anikst also presented Burns as a victim of the upper classes

[66] Molodaia gvardiia [Young Guard]

in the section of the article devoted to his youth. In an attempt to add ideological cohesion to this part of Burns's biography, Anikst wrote that the main reasons for the poet's alcohol problems were poverty and the suffering of the poor, which forced him to start drinking. Society was supposed to be responsible for his sorrows because he saw himself as helpless and unable to change anything. Grief and society's cruelty were the main reasons for his early death, but because a national poet could not be presented as a complete pessimist and sufferer, Anikst stressed the cheerful nature which helped Burns to cope with all obstacles with a smile on his face.

The last 'strike' was the statement that Burns was successfully married (only once, of course), adored his wife, and could be praised for his exemplary family life.

Interest in the new conception of Burns's life and poetry among Soviet critics was so great that in 1939 Sergey Orlov completed a doctoral degree entitled *Революционный дух в поэзии Бернса* (The Revolutionary Spirit in Burns's Poetry). This work included an interpretation of Burns' poems not as they were written in the original but as they should have been written from the very beginning. Orlov 'helped' Robert Burns to express what he really wanted to say in his poems but could not because of the pressure of English critics. He also wrote his own poems using elements of Burns's poems. In order to illustrate his 'translation' strategies, the poem "For a' That and a' That" may be used, which in Orlov's translation appears to be very different from Burns's original. In this case I have decided to provide the original and a translation of Orlov's translation into English to enable a comparison between the two versions.

Burns's original:

Is there for honest poverty
That hings his head, an' a' that?
The coward slave, we pass him by –
We dare be poor for a' that!
For a' that, an' a' that,
Our toils obscure, an' a' that,
The rank is but the guinea's stamp,
The man's the gowd for a' that.

2.
What though on hamely fare we dine,
Wear hoddin grey, an' a' that?
Gie fools their silks, and knaves their wine –

A man's a man for a' that.
For a' that, an' a' that,
Their tinsel show, an' a' that,
The honest man, tho' e'er sae poor,
Is king o' men for a' that.

3.
Ye see yon birkie ca'd 'a lord,'
Wha struts, an' stares, an' a' that?
Tho' hundreds worship at his word,
He's but a cuif for a' that.
For a' that, an' a' that,
His ribband, star, an' a' that,
The man o' independent mind,
He looks an' laughs at a' that.

4.
A prince can mak a belted knight,
A marquis, duke, an' a' that!
But an honest man's aboon his might –
Guid faith, he mauna fa' that!
For a' that, an' a' that,
Their dignities, an' a' that,
The pith o' sense an' pride o' worth
Are higher rank than a' that.

5.
Then let us pray that come it may
(As come it will for a' that)
That Sense and Worth o'er a' the earth
Shall bear the gree an' a' that!
For a' that, an' a' that,
It's comin yet for a' that,
That man to man the world o'er
Shall brithers be for a' that.

Translation of Orlov's translation:

We have to throw the old pressure!
Let's take the weapon! Let's revenge!
It is time to punish the lords
For all their crimes
The kings can no longer do evil
Their duty is to serve the country
Here are their actions,
They subordinated our freedom!

Today only that person is a patriot
Who is prepare to struggle for freedom
There is a crowd of arrogant nobles
Around the throne of the king
Here is the episcope, there is a judge
And other trash
We always hold up our backs
To those who tortured us
But now we are preparing
The loop and guillotine for them
There time has come – retribution is waiting
The freedom will lead us into struggle
The golden era is not a lie anymore
We will live as brothers
We will teach the young men
How the people should live
The coming era will prove for all
That our world is suitable for happiness
That a man is good and noble
By nature
Those who are waiting for the glory of freedom
Salute its rise!
(Orlov 1982: 26–27)

As has been established, it was also necessary to change Burns's biography. Nothing is supposed to be more important to the biographer than coming to know the essence of one's subject, but not in the case of Soviet biographers. Totalitarianism not only isolated Soviet readers from the outside world, it enclosed them in an artificial universe in which they had no standards of comparison. Burns's life-story was adapted by the Soviet translator Rait-Kovaleva, who published her materials about Robert Burns in 1954 in the journal *Новый мир*[67] (1954: 187–214). She emphasized that there was little known about Burns's life. Those biographies which were written in England and Scotland degraded the image of the national poet and never succeeded in revealing the democratic, revolutionary essence of his poetry. According to Rait-Kovaleva, English biographers of Burns attempted to present him as an alcoholic and uneducated peasant poet in order to lower his significance for world literature. All previous biographies were proclaimed to be 'bourgeois perversions' and Rait-Kovaleva carefully used Burns's letters and quotations from his poems which were supposed to pos-

[67] Novyi mir [New World]

sess autobiographical value. Her materials about Burns's life were warmly accepted as real documents which, finally, presented Burns in a true light.

Robert Burns's poems were changed and rewritten according to Soviet literary norms and rules. Because of this fabricated concept of his biography and his main ideas, he became enormously popular in the Soviet Union. After some drastic changes were made in the interpretation of his poems, Burns was made into a model example of a communist and revolutionary who was gladly accepted by Soviet critics and readers.

Samuil Marshak[68]

The image of Robert Burns in Russia is inseparable from that of his most famous translator, Samuil Marshak[69] (1887–1964), a dramatist, successful poet, political satirist and state propagandist, magazine editor, author of children's books and a close friend of Maksim Gorky. Samuil Marshak is often referred to as the "Soviet" father of Robert Burns and his translations have remained canonical for more than sixty years. Some have argued that this is not surprising, considering that Marshak was the only official translator of Burns in the Soviet Union. The word "official" means that his translations were accepted for publication by the authorities. However, no political or ideological power could force the readers to accept and love a poet. We must then pose the following question. Were Marshak's translations simply so good that Soviet readers accepted the image of Burns created by him in spite of all the ideological changes? To answer this question it would be helpful to recall the theory of Skopos. The most important factors for Skopos definition are the addressed audience and the intended purpose(s) of the translated text. With regard to the first factor, it may be useful to say that the main addressees of Marshak's translations were Soviet readers who were hardly familiar enough with the source language and culture to be able to notice ideological changes in Burns's translations. The lack of cultural knowledge of the world to which the originals refer on the part of the readers made it easier for Soviet translators (not only for

[68] All Marshak's translations quoted in the poem are taken from Robert Burns. 1982 [trans. Marshak, Samuil.]: *The Poetical Works*. Moscow: Raduga.

[69] He was not only a translator but a talented writer of children's fiction and poetry.

Marshak) to incorporate ideologically adapted elements. There were very few readers who would notice or even think about the outstanding differences between the translation and the original, especially considering that access to the originals was restricted in the Soviet Union.

As expected, Marshak was consistent in the source-text interpretation and translations strategy. It was absolutely clear for him what his translations were intended to mean to the addressed audience – in other words, what kind of communicative function they were aiming at.

Since ideology played a crucial role in the stability of the Soviet totalitarian state, defining the primary aim of Soviet literature as steering the reader toward ideologically desired behavior and ways of thinking, almost any translator's decision was – consciously or not – guided by ideological critera. Therefore the "objective translator" could not exist. Speaking about the intended purposes of the translated text concerning the addressed audience, the first and foremost aim of Marshak's translations was to advocate and promote the main virtues of the official communist doctrine, such as criticism of the morally deprived capitalist West and religion, promotion of democratic values, optimism, patriotism, positivism, depersonalization and the importance of proletarian revolution. There are far too many ideologically favourable constraints in Marshak's translations to be explained merely by his endeavour to make the text accessible to the target audience. In other words, we can say that Marshak's translations of Burns are manipulative and must be viewed as such. Hence, his work can be appreciated primarily for its literary qualities rather than faithfulness to the original.

However, while exposing the ideological background of Marshak's translations, I certainly do not intend to deny their unquestionable high level of quality. Marshak was not the only Soviet translator who resisted the unification and simplicity of the language sated with artificial, awkward linguistic formations which flourished in Soviet literature, contributing to the preservation of the literary Russian language for the next generations. Marshak's translations also enabled Soviet readers to at least catch a glimpse of Scotland. Even though they were ideologically adapted, translations were almost the only source of information about foreign lands and despite the fact that literary translations were strongly influenced by the prevailing ideology, the privilege of reading translated literature opened up a completely different perspective for those who had access to it.

To summarize, my intention in the following analysis is not to underestimate the value of Marshak's translations of Burns. It cannot be denied that it was thanks to Samuil Marshak that Burns achieved such extraordinary cultural dominance in the Soviet Union. What I intend to show is how and in which way Marshak's translations were ideologically adapted. After a brief introduction of the general features in Marshak's translations, I will discuss those examples which illustrate how Marshak placed his work in the overall ideological context. My intention is to analyze primarily the ideological adaptations carried out in the translations. For that reason, the analysis will include those translations which were clearly ideologically adapted.

Born in 1887 in a Jewish family in Voronezh, Marshak was one of the few Soviet translators who studied abroad. From 1912 to 1914 he studied philosophy at the University of London. The key to the success of Marshak's translations lies primarily in his sense for languages, Russian, English and even Scots, which he possessed to a high degree. After his return to Russia, Marshak devoted himself to translation, also translating Gianni Rodari, William Blake, Rudyard Kipling and William Shakespeare (he translated all 154 sonnets) besides Burns.

In Nadezdha Mandelstam's account of Marshak in *Hope Abandoned*, she notes that everything Marshak touched, his own poetry, his children's stories, his translations and editorial work, became anodyne. This was the price of his success, even survival, in Stalin's Russia. She describes him thus:

> Marshak was very much a man of his times in his determination to sweeten the pill of writing under orders, to create an illusion of literary life when it had been destroyed, and to smooth over all the rough edges (1974: 412).

Marshak[70] started his work on Robert Burns's poetry in 1930, and his first book was published shortly after the end of the Second World War, in 1947. Burns's poetry, as well as Shakespeare's sonnets, became his life task to which he devoted twenty years of hard work. In 1959, in an article published in the magazine *Культура и жизнь*[71], Marshak proclaimed that he was honoured and happy to give his countrymates the most extensive

[70] The fact that Marshak's translations of Burns's poetry became an outstanding literary sensation supported his election as honorary president of the Burns Federation in Scotland.

[71] Kul'tura i zhizn' [Culture and Life]

collection of Burns's translations and that his work remained unfinished (Marshak 1959: 60). Marshak continued to translate Burns's poetry until his death in 1964. The last book of Burns's translations, published after Marshak's death, contained 215 poems[72] and has remained the most extensive summary in the Russian language until the present time.

The first publication of Marshak's translations (1947) included:

- love poems such as "For the Sake o' Somebody", "A Red, Red Rose", "Oh Wert Thou in the Cauld Blast" (which became a popular song in Russia);
- nature lyrics, "Birks of Aberfeldey", "Yon Wild Mossy Mountains", "Afton Water";
- songs with humorous content "What Can a Young Lassie Do wi' an Auld Man", "Ye Hae Lien Wrang, Lassie", "Wha is That at My Bower-Door?", "Thou Has Left Me Ever, Jamie", "O Ken Ye What Meg o' the Mill Has Gotten", "Tam Glen";
- songs in which a girl refuses to marry a wealthy man and prefers a poor one, "My Collier Laddie", "Dusty Miller", "The Ploughman", "Country Lassie";
- poems "Tibbie I Hae Seen the Day", "The Ronalds of the Bennals", "Green Grow the Rashes O'", "Auld Lang Syne", "My Tochers the Jewel", "Comin Thro' the Rye, Poor Body", and many others.

It is obvious that from the beginning ideological guidelines were taken into consideration by Marshak. He rarely translated those poems which contained religious motifs (if they were not satirically coloured), poems with frivolous content (which was usually softened) and poems addressed to the poet's friends, acquaintances and patrons if they belonged to aristocratic circles. Clearly, 'Soviet' Burns could not maintain any connection with the upper classes. In poems devoted to the current political and social situation, Scotland and England were often replaced by "Russia", "родина" (homeland), "страна" (country) and other ideologically coloured equivalents. This translation choice completely changed the meaning and political value of these poems, which belong to the most extensive and original section of Burns's literary heritage.

[72] Burns, R. *Izbrannoe v perevodah Marshaka* [Chosen Poems Translated by Marshak] Moscow, 1976.

Love songs and ballads were not ideologically adapted to the extent as, for instance, political and patriotic lyrics, such as "For a' That and a' That", "The Tree of Liberty" or "MacPherson's Farewell". Translating Burns's songs and love lyrics, Marshak merely softened erotic connotations. However, as we shall see, this strategy also changed the meaning of some songs and poems. Burns's epigrams were also carefully translated.

Marshak took many liberties working with Burns, including the substitution and changing of words or transposing whole lines. Often Burns's poems were shortened in translation, as illustrated by the poem "The Holy Fair", of which Marshak translated hundred and fourteen lines instead of two hundred and fourty-three, and "The Dream" with seventy-two lines translated instead of hundred and thirty-five. In creating his translations, Marshak did not allow himself to change texts completely or to make free imitations, as was the case with Kozlov's romanticized translations of the nineteenth century. Following the official standards, which were unavoidable, Marshak strived to keep the original meaning, even though in some cases accuracy was extremely difficult to achieve. The privilege of ideas above other aspects of translation was also characteristic of Tat'iana Shchepkina-Kupernik's translation criteria. However, even though Marshak completely ignored the dialect of the original, translating into the literary Russian language, he achieved an astonishing assimilation of Burns to Russian culture.

The complete absence of dialect is another serious question which arises while discussing Marshak's translations. There is no doubt that it is very hard to preserve dialectal speech in translation. As a language variety, dialect carries cultural signs that cannot be translated (or better transformed) into any other language. Many translators try to avoid this problem by transferring the dialect into neutral language irrespective of the function the dialect has in the text. This was precisely what Marshak did. For some reason, he avoided using Russian dialects and even though it was possible to find correspondent equivalents, he replaced all the dialectical words with standard speech. We cannot say that Marshak used this strategy occasionally, as he ignored the dialect completely; there is literally no trace of the dialect in his translations. Neither can we find any commentaries, prefaces or footnotes which at least mention briefly that Burns also wrote in Scots. Of course, this had a more negative than positive impact on the quality of the translations as well as on the final impression it gave. As a talented translator, Marshak should have known that the effect the dialect

had in Burns's poetry was inescapably lost in his translations. It is difficult to imagine what influenced Marshak's decision. He must have realized that the differences between the languages would not allow him to preserve all the specific features of Scots; however, it would be worth trying, at least in some of the poems.

Marshak occasionally used Russian colloquial words, as in the poem "My Father Was a Farmer". Colloquial words used by Marshak include: "грош" (a small coin), "пожалуй" (well), "втуне" (of no use), "былое" (past) and "нужда" (misery). Translating a common expression used by Burns "my bonnie lassie" (in the poems "My Bonnie Mary", "Green Grow the Rashes", "Song on Miss W. A" and "Here's to thy Heart, my Bonnie Lass"), Marshak used both colloquial, "милая подружка" (sweet friend), "малютка"(the little one) and "девчонки" (girls), and more literal, "красавица" (beautiful woman), "единственная" (the only one), equivalents.

Speaking about the positive aspects of Marshak's translations, it should be noted that while allowing obvious ideological deviations from the original, Marshak tried to keep the poetic and thematic structure of the poems. For instance, in the poem "The Holy Fair", the idea is carefully transferred, and deviations from the original are evident only in the synonymic changes such as in the following stanza,

> Upon a simmer Sunday morn
> When Nature's face is fair,
> I walked forth to view the corn,
> An' sniff the callor air.
> The rising sun, owre Galston muirs,
> Wi' glorious light was glintan;
> The hares were hirplan down the furs,
> The lav' rocks they were chantin'
> Fu' sweet that day
> (Burns: 10–18)

Substitutions occur as follows: *morn* – день (*day*); *nature* – лето (*summer*) *caller air* – прохлада (*chilly air*); *lightsomely* – с радостью дыша (*joyfully breathing*); *changin'* – пели (*sing*), *rising sun* – большое солнце (*big sun*). These changes did not disturb the rhythm or the style of the poem and were used only to stress the images. However, Marshak shortened the poem by almost half.

For some reason, Marshak often changed the original titles of the poems, obviously following ideological principles in some cases. Thus, the poem "The Dusty Miller" was translated "Мельник" (Miller), as "dusty" was not an appropriate adjective to be attributed to a common worker who should be glorified. On the contrary, the word "farmer" in the title of the poem "My Father Was a Farmer" was modified and in the Russian translation the title is "Был честный фермер мой отец" (My father was an honest farmer). The translation of the title "For a' That and a' That" is "Честная бедность" (Honest poverty). Marshak decided elsewhere in favour of a more dramatic title, as in the poem "MacPherson's Farewell", which was translated "Макферсон перед казнью" (MacPherson before the execution).

Often, Marshak used the first line of the translation for the title, as in the poems "Country Lassie", translated as "Когда кончался сенокос" (When the harvest is over), "My Bony Mary", translated as "Вина мне пинту раздобудь" (Get me a pint of wine) and "Kissin' my Kattie", translated as "Был я рад когда гребень вытачивал" (I was happy when I was teething a heckle).

In some cases, Marshak did not want to deal with problematic cultural or geographical terms. In the translation of "Highland Laddie" the title is substituted by "Лучший парень" (The best lad) and the title of the poem "My Heart's in the Highland" is "Мое сердце в горах" (My heart is in the mountains). "The Lass of Ecclefechan" was translated "Объяснение" (Explanation). Marshak also avoided mentioning personal references in the titles. The poem "To J. S.***" was translated "К другу" (To the friend) and "Song on Miss W. A." – "Красавица из Баллохмэля" (Beautiful woman from Ballochmyle). The name Davie disappeared from the title of the poem "Epistle to Davie, a Brother Poet", which became "Послание к собрату-поэту" (Epistle to brother-poet).

Intratextual glosses (explanations given inside the text) were sometimes used in the translations of the titles to clarify details connected to specifically Scottish cultural items or historical persons. Thus, the title of the poem "To a Haggis" was translated "Ода Шотландскому пудингу Хаггис" (The ode to the Scottish pudding Haggis). An explanation was also added "Элегия на смерть Пег Николсон, лошади священника" (Elegy on the death of Peg Nicholson, the priest's horse) to the title of the poem "The Elegy on Peg Nicholson". The same thing happens in the epigram "On Fergusson", which was translated "К портрету Роберта Фергуссона, шотландского поэта" (To the portrait of Robert Fergusson,

a Scottish poet) and in the poem "Poor Mailie's Elegy" translated "Эллегия на смерть моей овцы, которую звали Мейли" (Elegy on the death of my sheep whose name was Mailie).

Softening Burns's erotic context, Marshak changed the title of the poems "The Lass That Made the Bed to Me" to "Ночлег в пути" (Lodging for the night on the way) and of "O Let me in this ae Night" to "Ночной разговор" (Night talk).

The title of the poem "The Ronnalds of the Bennals" is changed into "Девушки из Тарболтона" (Girls from Tarbolton). Marhsak most likely took the title from another poem "The Tarbolton Lasses", which he did not translate.

Occasionally the changes to the titles were successful. Thus, in the translation of the title "Holy Willie's Prayer", Marshak successfully used the Russian word "святоша", derived from the word "saint" but with the additional colloquial meaning of "hypocrite".

In some cases, Marshak merely substituted one word in translating the title, as in the poem "The Joyful Widdower" which was translated "Счастливый вдовец" (Happy widower). However, in most of the following cases it is difficult to find the reason for changing the title:

– "Song Composed in August" – "Конец лета" (The End of the summer);
– "Green Grow the Rashes O" – "Песня" (Song);
– "I'm o'er Young to Marry Yet" – "У мамы тихо я росла" (I was brought up peacefully by my mother);
– "The Ploghman" – "Мой парень" (My lad);
– "Auld Lang Syne" – "Старая дружба" (Old friendship);
– "A Waukrife Minnie" – "Домик у ручья" (Little house by the brook);
– "Wha is That at my Bower-door?" – Финдлей (Findley);
– "Robert's Bruce March to Bannockburn" – Брюс-Шотландцем (Bruce to Scots);
– "A Red, Red Rose" – Любовь (Love);
– "Oh Wert Thie in th e Cauld Blast" – В полях, под снегом и дождем (In the fields, under snow and rain);
– "Ae Fond Kiss" – "Расставание" (Farewell).

As regards the positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation described by van Dijk in his categorization of linguistic strategies aimed at stressing ideological connotations, Marshak presented a clear 'delineation' into 'us' (peasants and workers) and 'them' (aristocrats, landlords, monarchs and priests). It was not a hard task. Undoubtedly, Burns was honoured as an advocate of social and political change and a poet of the common man. His work is the continuing story of an ordinary Scotsman: his background, his encounters, his observations and thoughts. However, the national spirit in Burns's poetry was overstressed in Marshak's translations. The group of 'us', friends and supporters, was described in superlative terms, including such translation strategies as hyperbole, positive emphasis and high, prominent position. On the contrary, the out-group of enemies was described in negative terms. No wonder Marshak saw the need to stress these distinctions. The censorial recipe for enemies was just the opposite of that prescribed to friends: subtract good qualities and add negative ones (Ermolaev 1997: 88).

For a' That an' a' That

I will begin the analysis of Marshak's ideological adaptations of Burns's poetry with the translation of "For a' That and a' That", one of Burns's most powerful and emotional political poems, which expresses the idea of equality and brotherhood. Although faithful to the meaning of the original poem, Marshak's version includes several minor lexical changes which allowed him to bring the poem closer to the ideologically glorified principles of equality. This he achieved by degrading the potential 'enemies' represented by royalty and nobles, while at the same time exposing the priorities of the 'friends' to whom common workers and revolutionaries belonged. The most striking change is in the title, where Marshak used the strategy of a high prominent position, emphasizing the symbolic idea of the poem: "For a' That and a' That" becomes "Честная бедность" (Honest poverty).

The strategy of substitution aimed at satisfying ideological purposes is obvious in the translation of the philosophical conclusion of the first stanza, which states that man's dignity does not depend on his position and fortune. The translation of the lines "The rank is but the guinea-stamp / The *man's*

the gowd for a' that!" (7–8) is "Богатство штамп на золотом, а золотой – мы сами" / The wealth is the stamp on the gold, / But *we* are the gold ourselves. The word "rank" in the seventh line was replaced by "wealth" to stress the importance of material goods for the upper classes. By using the plural personal pronoun "we" (common in Soviet propagandistic slogans) instead of "man", Marshak softens the individualistic tone of the original. The nuance in the translation seems insignificant, as "the man" and "we ourselves" mean almost the same, but in the context created by Marshak, the plural personal pronoun "we" is more likely used to differentiate the honest poor from the dishonest rich. It is also possible that Marshak introduced the first person plural pronoun on his own initiative because such a simple device is most effective in engaging the reader's emotional interest.

The **rank** is but the guinea's stamp,
The **Man's** the gowd for a' that
(Burns: 6–8)

Богатство-	*The **wealth** is-*
Штамп на золотом,	*The stamp on the gold,*
А золотой-	*But **we** are the gold*
Мы сами	*Ourselves.*
(Marshak: 7–11)	

The strategy of intensification of the miserable living conditions of workers, common in Marshak's translations, is used in the translation of the lines "What tought on hamely fare we dine. / Wear hoddin grey, an a' that?" (9–10). Clearly, Marshak did not consider the term "hamely fare" powerful enough to convey the poor living conditions of the Scots. He thus substituted "hamely fare" with "bread and water" and "hoddin grey" with "rags".

What tought on hamely fare we dine.
Wear hoddin grey, an a' that?
(Burns: 9–10)

Мы хлеб едим и воду пьем,	*We eat bread and drink water,*
Мы укрываемся трепьем	*We cover ourselves with rags*
(Marshak: 9–10)	

The strategy of marginalization can be seen in the line "A prince can make *a belted knight*/A marquis, duke, an' a' that" (25–26) which was translated "король лакея своего назначил генралом" / A king appointed his *serv-*

ant a general. Instead of "a belted knight", the word "servant" was used. Following the direction of anti-monarchist propaganda, Marshak stressed that a prince could not have knights around him but merely servants. The Russian word "lakei" used in the translation originally described a man employed as a servant, however, in the new, post-revolutionary context it acquired a more humiliating meaning, a "lick-spittle", a man who served aristocrats before the revolution. With reference to "lakei", Marshak tends to use a more insulting equivalent than in the original, and so his translation seems more negative in its attitude towards the monarchy. It is also possible that Marshak's intention was to stress that a prince, or in Marshak's case king, was not particularly clever. It is hard to imagine that any sensible monarch could make his servant a general. In fact, by using the word "general" instead of "marquis" and "duke", Marshak intensified the possible stupidity of the monarch.

A prince can mak **a belted knight**
A marquis, duke, an a' that
(Burns: 25–26)

Король **лакея** своего	*A kind apponted his **'lakei'***
Назначил генералом	*A general.*
(Marshak: 32–33)	

The expression "guid faith" used in the original was deleted in Marshak's translation.

The same strategy was used in the translation of the lines "The honest man, though e'er sae poor, /Is king o' men for a' that" (15–16). Drawing a comparison with the 'main enemy', the king, could have been insulting for Soviet readers. The enemy had to be introduced as stupid, selfish, deceitful, aggressive, hostile, or even evil. Thus, Marshak substituted "king" with "знать" (nobility) and modified the definition of "the honest man" by specifying that an honest man is a man who earns his living with honest work,

The honest man, though e'er sae poor,
Is **king** o men for a' that
(Burns: 15–16)

Кто честным кормится трудом	*Those who earn a living with honest work*
Того зову я **знатью**	*I call **nobles**.*
(Marshak: 21–22)	

In the line "He's but a cuif for a' that" (20), Marshak substitutes the word "cuif" (fool) with "бревно" (log) which he uses three more times in the following stanza. Direct translation of the word "cuif" was out of the question because the Russian word "дурак" (fool) is a strong insult, and Marshak never allowed swearwords in his translations. This comparison contributed to the original purpose by evoking an association with the famous phrase "тупой как дерево" (as stupid as a tree/wood).

The strategy of deletion was used in the last stanza, in which the phrase "Then let us pray that come it may" (33) was substituted by "Настанет день и час пробьет" / The day and hour will come (33). Common workers, glorified in the poem, could not pray for their freedom. Another change occurred in the substitution of the conditional verb "may" by a more certain "it will come". If Burns was not certain that Sense and Worth would come on earth but nevertheless believed in the power of prayer, Marshak was absolutely sure that this would happen without praying.

Then let us pray that come it may,
As come it will for a' that,
The Sense and Worth, o'er a' the earth
Shall bear the gree an a'that
(Burns: 33–40)

Настанет день и час пробьет	***The day and hour will come***
Когда уму и чести.	*When mind and honour*
На всей земле придет черед	*Will be put into first place*
Стоять на первом месте	*All over the world*
(Marshak: 43–46)	

However, in general, Marshak's treatment of the poem's rhetoric, heightened by the use of the traditional refrain "при всем при том, при всем при том" (and more of it, and more of it) repeated at the end of each stanza, resulted in a rhythmical but at the same time melodic translation.

MacPherson's Farewell

The best example of the strategy of positive emphasis, which in most cases may be defined as the strategy of idealization, occurs in the poem "Macpherson's Farewell". The original poem has a historical background and was *based on the story of the real Jamie MacPherson*, a highway robber. According to sources, he *composed his famous farewell song before he was hanged on November 16*, *1700*. MacPherson sang this song on his way to the scaffold, which later became a famous ballad[73].

Since there existed a deep divide between the idealized Soviet hero, who projected an image of strength, virility, and unyielding drive in his desire to serve the socialist state, and the non-communist enemy, there was no place left for ambiguous, 'suspicious' characters. For that reason, in Marshak's translation, MacPherson was transformed into a national hero and a revolutionary, identified as a warrior and a brave pirate in the commentary to Marshak's collected poems. The first two lines of the poem were simply written. Instead of saying goodbye to the dungeons, MacPherson greets the prisons of the king where slaves suffer,

Farewell, ye dungeons dark and strong
The wretch's destinie!
(Burns: 1–2)

Привет вам тюрьмы короля,	*Hello to you, the prisons of the **king***
Где жизнь влачат рабы	*Where **slaves** suffer.*
(Marshak: 1–2)	

As you can see, "king" has not only been added but the word "wretch" has also been replaced by "slaves". These references shift the meaning of the poem, focusing primarily on the negative image of the monarch, not present in the original. In translation Marshak also uses a phraseological, highly poetical expression "влачить жизнь", which can be translated as "to spend the life in sufferings". We cannot talk about a strategy of substitution in this case, as Marshak did not substitute but completely changed these lines, promoting a negative image of the monarchy.

[73] One of the variants of this ballad "MacPherson's Rant or the Last Words of James MacPherson" was written in the eighteenth century.

Adjectives such as as “wantonly”, “dauntingly”, “rantingly” are missing, while the main occupation of the hero, a robber, was changed into “war”, which he talks about it in the highest and most pathetic tone.

O what is death but parting breath?[74]
On many a bloody pain
(Burns: 9–10).

В **полях войны** среди мечей	*In the **fields of war**, among swords*
Встречал я смерть не раз	*I meet death many times.*
(Marshak: 11–12).	

The translation of the line “I’ve liv’d a life of sturt and strife” (17) again indicates a pathetic tone, “Я жизнь свою провел в бою”/ I spent my life in the fields of fight. Naturally, the inflection of the “fields of fight” refers to the primary occupation mentioned in the original, yet the fact remains that MacPherson’s heroism is overstressed in the translation. It was also explained that MacPherson was not simply betrayed but that a traitor gave his life to the executioner’s rope.

I die by treacherie
(Burns: 20)

Изменник предал жизнь мою	*The traitor gave my life*
Веревке палача	*To the executioner’s rope.*
(Marshak: 21–22)	

If in the original MacPherson expresses his rage that he will not be revenged in only two lines, “It burns my heart I must depart / And not avenged be”. Marshak develops this idea by adding two lines of his own,

Но перед смерть об одном	*But before death my soul*
Душа моя грустит,	*Is sad because of one thing,*
Что за меня в краю родном	*No one will revenge me*
Никто не отомстит	*In my native country.*
(Marshak: 23–26)	

[74] The ninth line “Oh! What is death but parting breath” is reminiscen of Spencer’s “Death with most grim and grisly visage seene, / Yet is he nough but parting of the breath” (The Faerie Queene, VII, VII, 46).

Obviously, in Marshak's translation MacPhersons's execution becomes a national issue. He should have been revenged by someone from his native country. Instead of "burning heart", Marshak decided to use the less passionate and more poetic substance "душа моя грустит" (my soul is sad).

Farewell from the light and sunshine in the line "Now farewell light, – thou sunshine bright" (24) was substituted with the farewell from MacPherson's "край" (native place in the meaning of homeland), "Прощай мой край весь мир прощай" / Farewell my homeland, farewell the whole world (Marshak: 27–28).

The strategy of deletion of Scotland also occurs in this translation as the seventeenth line "And there's no man in all Scotland" was cut out.

The Twa Dogs by Samuil Marshak

Significant changes were also made in the translation of the poem "The Twa Dogs". The fundamental idea of the poem that virtue does not depend on wealth, as well as criticism of human inequality and social injustice of enforced class division, perfectly corresponded to the ideological scheme. For that reason, there are no significant changes in the content. The differences, instead, are in intentional intensifying of ideologically favourable elements such as social differences between classes and deemphasizing of ideologically questionable elements such as references to religious context.

One of the main tendencies in Marshak's translations was omission of religious references. As a poet who was pronounced to be a democrat and a communist, Burns was not supposed to use any religious references in his poetry. The most convenient strategy in this case appeared to be the strategies of deletion, as we have already seen in the translation of "For a' That and a' That" or substitution.

The strategy of substitution is used in the following lines,

> An there began a lang digression
> About the 'lords o the creation'
> (Burns: 45–46)

И разговор они вели	*They were talking about people*
О людях – о царях земли	*– the tsars of the earth.*
(Marshak: 45–46)	

The expression "the lords o the creation" taken from the biblical context could not be translated literally, as Christian allusions were strictly forbidden. "The lords of the creation" in the Bible refer to "men". In Marshak's translation it was substituted by a close but ideologically more favourable statement that people are the tsars of the Earth. The strategy of deletion was applied to all expressions which contained the word "Lord": "L_ _d knows how lang" was deleted from the 28th line, "Lord" disappears from the address used to illustrate Caesar's astonishment in the phrase "L_ _d man, our gentry care as little /For delvers, ditchers, an' sic cattle" (116–117), while Caesar's exclamations "guid faith" (150) and "Lord, man" (189) were not also not translated.

It is clear from close analysis of the text that the main tendency in Marshak's translation is to intensify the negative image of the upper class whose members had to be portrayed as merciless exploiters. The most useful strategy in this case is the strategy of negative stress. While in the original Caesar "Was keepit for his Howner's pleasure" (8), Marshak decided to arouse the readers' sympathy by ascribing Caesar a new occupation, "В усадьбе лорда службу нёс" / He was in service in Lord's usad'ba[75].

Another important ideological guideline was intensifying the poor living conditions of the Scottish peasantry. The same tendency is characteristic of Shchepkina-Kupernik's translation. It has already been mentioned that Soviet propaganda expected criticism of life in the capitalist West to be expressed in the most negative terms.

In the initial lines of his first stanza, Caesar uses expressions "poor dogs" (48) and "poor bodies" (50).

I've often wonder'd, honest Luath,
What sort o life **poor dogs** like you have;
An when the gentry's life I saw,
What way **poor bodies** liv'd ava
(Burns: 47–40)

[75] Old-fashioned Russian expression for a rich house

Translating “poor dogs”, Marshak used the word “бедняжки” (poor things) which corresponded well to the original in which Caesar patronizes his friend. Obviously, the expression “poor bodies” was not powerful enough to express the subordinate position of the lower class and was replaced by “жильцы лачуг” (inhabitants of poor hovels). The original Russian word “лачуга” means “shanty”, a very poor hovel. This substitution changes the impact of the poem in two different ways. First, Marshak’s attaches more negative connotations to Caesar’s speech, transforming his curiosity into scorn. In the original, the entire fragment focuses on Caesar’s satirical depiction of his lord’s life, yet there is no indication of him being well aware of the conditions of a peasant life. For that reason, he is interested in Luath’s answer. On the contrary, Marshak’s translation presumes that Caesar is well informed about the situation and mocks his friend by asking how it feels to live in a shanty. Second, the reader is given the impression that Luath and his master live in a shanty.

Мой честный Лю́ат! Верно, тяжкий	*My honest Luath! I assume*
Удел достался вам, бедняжки.	*You, poor things, do not have an easy life.*
Я знаю только высший круг,	*I know only the high society to whom*
Которому жильцы лачуг…	*The **inhabitants of shanties**.*
(Marshak: 61–63)	

Marshak uses the same expression “лачуга” three more times, constantly reminding the readers of the conditions of peasant life, as in the translation of the lines, “An’ what poor cot-folk pit their painch in, / I own it’s past my comprehension” (69–70).

А что едят **жильцы лачуг-**	*But what **the inhabitants of shanties** eat –*
При все своем воображенье,	*I can’t imagine,*
Я не имею представленья	*Even though I have rich imagination!*
(Marshak: 88–90)	

In the rest of the translation, Marshak continues to intensify the negative image of the upper classes. In the translation of the section in which Caesar satirically criticizes the privileged life of his owner, “He rises when he likes himsel’; /His flunkies answer at the bell (52–53), the verb “to answer” is substituted with “to run”; the part of the line “when he likes himself” is not translated at all, while the noun “flunky” is modified. In Marshak’s translation, the flunky does not simply answer the bell but runs, bending his neck,

He rises when he likes himsel'
His flunkies answer at the bell
(Burns: 53–54)

Открыв глаза звонит лакею	*When he opens his eyes, he calls the flunky*
И тот бежит, **сгибая шею**	*Who is running,* ***bending the neck****.*
(Marshak: 69–70)	

This additional humiliation of the servant is not exposed in the original.

At the end of Caesar's second stanza, "While they maun stan', wi aspect humble / An' heat it a', an' fear an' tremble" (99–100), Marshak decided to invent two words of his own, taken from popular communist slogans, to describe a "factor" (96) as a "мошенник" (swindler) and a "тунеядец" (someone who does not want to work). The Russian word "тунеядец" is particularly significant as it was often used in communist propaganda to describe former landowners.

А бедный терпет и молчит	*And the poor man stands quietly.*
Он с малых лет привык бояться	*From his early years, he used to*
Мошенника и тунеядца	*Be afraid of a* ***swindler*** *and a* ***parasite****.*
(Marshak: 98–100)	

In what follows, Luath answers Caesar's question about the conditions of his master's life, explaining the difficulties, poverty and starvation they must face but concluding with an optimistic statement: "An' buirdly chiels, an' clever hizzies,/ Are bred in sic a way as this is" (85–86). Marshak again allows more freedom in the translation by adding the word "*лачуга*" (shanty) again. This time, he uses the diminutive "*лачужка*".

Немало статных молодцов	*Many stout lads*
И прехорошеньких подружек	*And very pretty girls.*
Выходит из таких **лачужек**	*Come from such* ***shanties****.*
(Marshak: 110–112).	

The strategy of substitution with de-emphasis appears in the translation of Luath's statement that "sure great folk's life's a life o' pleasure" (186). Marshak transforms the phrase into a rhetorical moral question which changes the meaning completely. Luath is certain in the original that his friend's life is easy and happy; in Marshak's translation, however he has serious doubts about it.

Теперь скажи: твой высший свет	*Now tell me if your high society,*
Вполне ли счастлив или нет?	*Is happy enough or not?*
(Marshak: 243–244)	

In some examples, Marshak's translation has more pathos than is found in Burns or even in Shchepkina-Kupernik. Thus, the concluding lines of the twelfth stanza, "I see how folk live that hae riches; / But surely poor folk maun be wretches" (101–102), are substituted by a more pathetic statement. Again, in the original Caesar does not know precisely what kind of life his friend has, stating merely that they must be wretches, but Marshak's translation signifies that Caesar is well aware of Luath's living conditions. He states that poor people do not know happiness, must live in poverty and work hard.

Не знает счастья нищий люд.	*Poor people do not know happiness*
Его удел – нужда и труд!	*Their destiny is poverty and hard work!*
(Marshak: 131–132)	

The strategy of deletion was used to omit mentioning Britain in lines 148 and 150. Instead of Britain, the word "страна" (country) was used.

One of the most problematic issues in the translation of the poem was Caesar's description of his lord's travelling during which he denies himself no pleasure. The phrase "Wh_re-hunting amang groves o' myrtles" (Burns: 164) could not be translated directly, considering the fact that Soviet critics were overly sensitive to any issues connected to sexual or erotic themes. However, it should be noted that Burns's original also shows the influence of censoring, in this case self-censoring. Burns shortened the words "whore" (wh_re), "whoring" (wh_ring) and "lord" (l_ _ d), discussed above, as religious structures at that time would not have allowed him to write in full. Similarly, in the Soviet Union, direct translations of the words "whore" and "whoring" would be censored for the sake of immorality, while the word "lord" was omitted for a different reason, the overall tendency of erasing religious context from the Soviet discourse. Hence, Marshak did not follow the strategy of shortening used in the original but substituted these problematic words with more suitable terms.

Instead of the original "whoring", Marshak uses a more poetic epithet "смуглые девы" (dark ladies). Thus in his translation, Caesar's master was chasing dark ladies. The meaning of the translation is obscure as it is not clear who the dark ladies are and why anyone would be chasing them.

In what follows, Caesar also mentions the unpleasant consequences of "whore-hunting", "An' clear the consequential sorrows,/Love-gifts of Carnival Signioras" (Burns: 167–168). Marshak did his best to avoid reference to venerial disease but his translation is again unclear.

Да смыть нескромный след, который	*And wash away the immodest trace*
Оставлен смуглою синьорой	*Left by the dark signora.*
(Marshak: 211–212)	

Soviet readers had to use all their imagination to interpret these lines.

The Tree of Liberty

An appeal to liberty and freedom in Britain in the poem "The Tree of Liberty", inspired by the French Revolution, takes on the quality of an appeal to world revolution in Marshak's translation, leaving very little of the "auld England" spirit, so essential to the original poem. In point of fact, Britain is mentioned in merely one line. On the basis of Marshak's translation, one might conclude that Burns was concerned about revolution all over the world. The primary translation strategies are those of substitution and deletion, as well as generalizing. Thus, in the concluding lines of the poem Marshak refers to a more unifying expression "народы и края" (nations and places). This substitution shifts the meaning to stress Burns's concern about revolutionary progress in the entire world and not merely in capitalist England.

Like brethren in a common cause,
    We'd on each other smile, man;
And equal rights and equal laws
    Wad gladden every isle, man
(Burns: 89–92)

Забудут рабство и нужду	***The nations and places***
Народы и края, брат	*Will forget about poverty and slavery, brother*
И будут люди жить в ладу	*And the people will live peacefully*
Как дружная семья, брат	*As a family, brother.*
(Marshak: 85–88)	

The word "man" at the end of each stanza was replaced by "брат" (brother), since this word would have more positive connotations in the eyes of the Soviet censors than "man"[76].

The next lines were completely changed in the translation,

Gif ance the **peasant** taste a bit,
He's greater than a lord, man,
And wi the beggar shares a mite
O a' he can afford, man.
(Burns: 13–16)

In the lines "Gif ance the peasant taste a bit, / He's greater than a Lord, man,", the word "peasant" was replaced by "холоп" (kholop) (an old-fashioned Russian word meaning "a designated slave", or in modern Russian a "subordinated, humiliated man") and the comparison with the Lord was deleted. Raising the peasant to God's level appeared to be offensive.

Его вкусить холопу дай	*You give it to **kholop***
Он станет благородым	*He will become more noble.*
(Marshak: 13–14)	

It is interesting that in Marshak's translations, there is more or less only one lexical item referring to the word "peasant", which is "kholop", an apparently more abusive term. For the translator, the context in which the word is used is important as it guides the choice of the potential equivalent. Soviet literature glorified collective labour and exemplified peasants and workers as new men of Soviet society who possessed superior moral and social consciousness. For that reason, the word "peasant", an extremely positive term in Soviet discourse, could not be used in its original sense to describe the lowest social level.

In the following line "An' wi' the beggar shares a mite", Marshak translates the word "beggar" as "товарищ" (comrade), which sounded much more 'in the communist spirit'. In fact, there could be no beggars in a happy communist society.

[76] The same substitution of the word "man" also appeared in the poem "The Ronnalds of the Bennals" in which it was probably chosen for the sake of the rhyme.

И свой разделит каравай	*And he will share his bread*
С товарищем голодным	*With a hungry comrade.*
(Marshak: 14)	

It is interesting that in the case of this poem, Marshak decided to mention Britain in the lines,

Let Britain boast her hardy oak,
Her poplar and her pine, man,
Auld Britain ance could crack her joke
And o'er her neighbours shine, man
(Burns: 57–60)

Marshak deliberately omitted any mention of Scotland or Britain in other translations. In these lines, however, Burns criticizes the absence of liberty in Britain, an issue often exposed in Soviet political propaganda. Marshak also cut the original poem by eight lines, as he didn't translate the lines from 72–80.

Marshak did not translate the eleventh stanza, probably to avoid destroying the idea of a universal revolution by mentioning "old England".

Such wholesome, dainty cheer, man!
Woe befall the fellow who would not eat
I would give the shoes from off my feet,
To taste the fruit of it here, man!
Then let us pray, Old England may
Sure plant this far-famed tree, man
And blithe we will sing, and herald the day
That gives us liberty, man
(Marshak: 81–88)

To the Guidwife of Wauchope House

In the first lines of the poem, Marshak confronted the tricky task of softening Burns's eroticism, as Burns cheerfully states that "When first amang the yellow corn / A man I reckon'd was" (7–8). Marshak decided to erase this problematic moment translating,

В одном со взрослым строю Товарищ их по плугу. (Marshak: 7–8)	*I was in the same lineup with grown-ups* *I was their comrade by plogh.*

As you can see, the issue of becoming a man is not mentioned at all. By using the words "comrade" and "lineup", a military term in Russian, Marshak steers the meaning of the poem in an ideologically more favourable direction. The tone of the translation becomes more serious and pathetic, while the slightly frivolous context completely disappears. The translation creates the impression that for Burns it was most important to work with his comrades in the field.

One of the most obvious ideological changes in this poem is the substitution of culture-specific items, including the word "Scotland". This can be understood from the translator's point of view because the mention of foreign names sometimes makes the comprehension of a poem more difficult for the reader and demands additional comments. As Christiana Nord points out, just a quick glance at the translated text can reveal that translators do all sorts of things with names, such as substitute, transcribe and omit them (2003: 182). Obviously, the presence of foreign names in a translation brings with it the risk of creating a linguistic barrier for readers. According to Tymoczko, the referential function of the names presupposes their "recognizability" and "memorability" because they must "in some way be memorable so as to serve their function as indicators of unique objects" (1999: 225).

But the omission of Scotland became a characteristic feature of Marshak's translation. The word "Scotland" was usually replaced with "родина" (homeland) and "страна" (country). As a result of this translation policy, Robert Burns, the national poet of Scotland, became an international poet who struggled for human rights and glorified the democratic spirit all over the world, not just in Scotland. It should be noted that this decision is one of the most contentious because this misrepresentation destroys the idea of Burns as the national Scottish (specifically only Scottish) poet. Love and care for the motherland, the most important images in Burns's poetry, are missing in Marshak's translations. The main reason for this 'social demand' is hard to explain. Probably, as a European country and a part of Great Britain, Scotland was also considered a capitalist county and the fact that Burns was "unlucky" to have been born in the capitalist country should have been omitted.

The "poor auld Scotland" is substituted in the poem with "страна" (country).

That I for **poor auld Scotland** sake
Some useful plan, or book could make,
Or sing a sang at least
(Burns: 54–56).

Одной мечтой с тех пор я жил	*I have had only one dream*
Служить **стране** по мере сил	*To serve my **country** as well as I can.*
(Пуская они и слабы)	*(Even though my forces are weak)*
Народу пользу принести	*To bring something **good to the nation***
Ну, что-нибудь изобрести	*Well, to invent something*
Иль песню спеть хотя бы.	*Or at least to sing a song.*
(Marshak: 53–58)	

As usual, Marshak adds his own ideas. In Burns's original, a reference to the poet's wish to contribute something valuable to his country is expressed in a cheerful tone. In Marshak's translation, the poet is seriously concerned about how he can serve his country and make a positive contribution to the nation. He even admits that his forces are weak. Marshak also introduces the word "nation" to stress the idea of the poet being at the service of the people.

There are several other ideological adaptations in the same poem. In what follows, Burns says that he is proud because he is a Scot,

No nation, no station
    My envy e'er could raise
A **Scot** still, but **blot** still
    I knew no higher praise.
(Burns: 61–64)

Marshak uses the word "peasant" in his translation, reminding the readers of Burn's background.

Пусть родом	*Let an **honourable lord***
Доходом	*Be proud of his income*
Гордится знатный лорд –	*And clan.*
Шотландской, **крестьянской**	*I was proud because of my*
Породой был я горд	***Scottish, peasant** background.*
(Marshak: 63–64)	

The word "blot" means "without" and could hardly be confused for "peasant", even if Marshak was not particularly familiar with the vernacular. However, it was important for Marshak to remind his readers whenever possible that Burns belonged to the lower class and was born into a poor farmers' family. This is hardly surprising. For Soviet critics and censors, in most cases the writer's background was far more important than their literary achievements. Burns's common background was the primary reason he was allowed to be translated in the Soviet Union in the first place.

Translating the first lines of the stanza in which Burns says that nothing could make him envious, "no nation, no station", Marshak is more concrete. He introduces an "honourable lord" who is not present in the original, making Burns's statement more polical. Marshak also achieves an ideologically favourable contrast between the lord as the representative of the criticized upper class and Burns as the representative of the lower, peasant class in the same stanza.

The idea of social differences is promoted in the rest of Marhsak's translation. Thus, in the original Burns briefly mentions "For you, na bred to barn and byre", stating that his addressee belongs to a different social class. Marshak decided to intensify this idea by adding his own lines, clarifying the social position of the "guidwife of Wauchope-House". Instead of briefly mentioning "barn and byre", Marshak goes into precise details.

Пусть вы, сударыня, росли	*You, lady, you were grown up*
Под кровом дедовским вдали	*Under the roof of your grandfather*
От наших изб крестьянских	*Far from our **peasant cottages**.*
Вам незнаком амбар и хлев.	*You don't know bars and stalls.*
(Marshak: 64–66)	

As you may notice, the word "peasant" is used again.

Omission of mentioning Scotland

There are many examples of omitting any mention of Scotland in Marshak's translations. In the last line of the poem "John Barleycorn" "And may his great posterity/Ne'er fail in old Scotland", Marshak erased the

word Scotland, destroying the originality of the poem, which was based on numerous songs and ballads about John Barleycorn, popular in English and Scottish folklore.[77]

Scotland is not mentioned in the translation of "MacPherson's Farewell", "Ans there's no a man in all Scotland" (16).

In the poem "The Twa Dogs", in the line "For Britain's guid his saul indention" (148), the word Britain was replaced with "country". The very first line of the same poem, "T' was in that place o' Scotland's isle", was deleted.

In the poem "My heart's in the Highland", in which Burns expressed his deep nostalgic feelings, the line "The hills of the Highlands for ever I love" (8) was translated "Навеки останусь я сыном твои" / I will remain your son forever.

The names of Scottish rivers, lakes, cities and countries are also omitted. For instance, translating "For lake o' thee I leave this much-loved shore/ Never perhaps to greet old Scotland more! (35–36) from the poem "Lines written on a Bank-note", Marshak used the expression "край родной" (native place) instead of "Scotland", "Я покидаю край родной" / I am leaving my native place.

In the poem "Elegy on Peg Nicholson", the name of the river Carin is cut out; only the "river" is mentioned, "But now she's floating down the Nith/ And past the Mouth o' Carin" (56–58). The name "Leith" is not mentioned in the translation of the poem "Go Fetch Me a Pint o' Wine" in the translation of the following lines,

> The boat rocks at the pier o' Leith,
> Fu' loud the wind blaws frae the ferry,
> The ship rides by the Berwick-law,
> And I maun leave my bonny Mary.
> (Burns: 44–48)

In the poem "Rattlin, Roarin Willie", in the line "As I cam by Crochallan", Crochallan was replaced by "город" (city). In the poem "There Was a Lad", the place "Kyle" is not mentioned in the first line.

[77] Burns's direct source was probably a poem from a book of folklore published in 1781: "There came three merry men from the east/And three merry men were thry/And they did sware a solemn oath/That Sir John Barlaycorn they would slay" (Laing 1985: 64–66).

In the poem "Song. On Miss W. A.", translated as "A Beautiful Woman from Ballochmyle", Burns proclaimed that if his beloved was "a country Maid" then "Though shel'red in the lowest shed / That ever rose on Scotia's plain" (27–28). First, Marshak erased "Scotia" and second, intensified the reference to poor living conditions mentioned in the original,

Я счастлив был бы нищетой	*I will be happy with **destitution***
И самой бедною лачужкой	*And with the **poorest shanty**.*
(Marshak: 27–28)	

This is not the first example in Marshak's translations of the use of the words "destitution" and "shanty". The reader was presumably left with the impression that all Scottish peasants lived in shanties. The line "Give me the God below the pine" (37) was not translated because of the reference to "God".

"Scotia" was also erased from the translation of the line "And for fair Scotia, hame again" (11) from the poem "When Wild War's Deadly Blast Was blawn". The name Nancy was substituted by Anna in the same poem, presumably for the sake of the rhyme. Another slight change occurs in the translation of the lines,

Quo' she, my grandsire left me gowd,
A mailin plenish'd fairly;
And come, my faithful sodger lad,
Thou'rt welcome to it dearly!
(Burns: 53–56)

If in the original a young woman merely welcomes her lover, a soldier, to the house which she inherited from her grandfather, while in Marshak's translation she decides to give everything she has to her lover. Marshak most likely concluded that it would be highly selfish of a common country girl to keep everything for herself instead of sharing it with her lover, who definitely deserved it. The idea of sharing everything, especially private property, held a prominent place in the pyramid of communist ideological values.

In the poem "Jolly Beggars", the Scottish pipe is not mentioned in "Syne tun'd his pipes wi' grave grimace" which is translated as "Он прохрипел свои куплеты"/ He sang his songs with husky voice.

In the poem "The Ronalds of the Bennals", there is a phrase "My coat and my vest, they are Scotch o' the best". The word "Scotch" disappears in the translation.

In the poem "Song – Contented Wi' Little, and Carttie Wi' Mair", in the line "Wi' a cog o' guade swats and an auld Scotish sang", the word Scottish was cut out.

In the poem "Address to the Tooth-Ache", in the line "Gie a' the faes o' Scotland's weal/A towmond's tooth-ache!", the word Scotland was replaced with the word "страна" (country).

References to Scottish traditions and cultural objects were also often deleted. For instance, in the translation of the poem "The Auld Farmer's New-Year morning Salutation to his Auld Mare, Maggie", "Scotch mile" and "brooses" (a traditional ride from the church to the house of the groom, typical of Scottish wedding ceremonies) disappear. "Erlay"[78] (a neckerchief, a traditional part of Scottish dress) is not mentioned in the translation of "The Ploughman". "Black cockades" (cockades were worn by royal soldiers) disappear from the translation of the poem ""The Battle of Sherra-moor". "Kilbaigie" (wisky) in "Jolly Beggars" is deleted and "hornpipes, jigs, strathspeys and reels" in "Tam O' Shanter" were translated as "шотландские пляски" (Scottish dances).

Orthographic adaptation (including such procedures as transcription and transliteration) were also common. Examples: "To a Haggis", "The Birks of Aberfeldy", "The Banks o' Doon", "Afton Water"; "Duncan Gray" "The Ronald of the Bennals"; "Death and Doctor Hornbook" (h-g): Cumnock ("Death and Doctor Hornbook") – "Kamiuk" (o-iu);

When dealing with cultural elements, Marshak's translation often adopts the strategy of localization/absolute universalization, which means that the translator attempts "to anchor a reference firmly in the culture of the target audience" (Davies 2003: 72). Obviously, he considered expressions typical of the English cultural background incomprehensible to Russian readers and decided to erase all possible awareness of a different cultural content. Undoubtedly, this decision created a sense of familiarity and helped Russian readers to enter the magnificent world of Burns's poetry. On the other hand, an almost complete familiarization of cultural items can hardly serve

[78] Eraly also appears in Ramsey's poem "The Gentle Shepherd": "He falds his o'erlay down his Breast wi' care" (I, II, 41). Eraly is described in James Mitchell's book about Scottish country dress in XVIII *Memories* (264).

as a tool for learning about foreign cultures, times and customs. Marshak's substitutions extend to the smallest details of Russian cultural life. Thus, he uses both Russian measures of length and monetary units, Russian clothes, music instruments, etc.

Other examples of absolute universalization include the poem "The Battle of Sherra-moor" in which "tartan trews" was translated "клетчатые штаны" (chequered pants). In the "The Ronalds of the Bennals", the word "laird" was translated "помещик" (a typical Russian expression for a landlord). "Farls" from the "The Holy Fair" becomes "лепёшки" (a typical Russian food made of corn) and "pence" was translated "монетка" (small coin). "Coat" in the poem "To J. S." was substituted with "кафтан" (a typical Russian item of clothing, a kind of coat). Instead of "fiddle" in "Rattin, roatin Willi" the word "скрипка" (violin) was used. "Guineas" in the poem "The Ronalds of the Bennals" were converted into "монеты" (coins). Translating "lang Scotch ells twa" in the poem "Death and Doctor Hornbook", Marshak used a typical Russian archaic expression for a measure of length "косая зажень". "Cutty-stool" in the poem "Address to the Tooth-Ache" was translated "pillory".

Monarchy in Marshak's translations

The strategy of a low, non-prominent position is observed in the cases Burns mentions with some sympathy kings, as well as princes, generals, dukes and other members of high society, assigning them certain merits. In the revolutionary colored poems it was always the people and the nation who enabled victory and freedom. Thus, in the translation of the poem "Scots Wha Hae", which has the subtitle "Robert Bruce's address to His Army, Before the Battle of Bannockburn", it is impossible to understand that the main idea of the poem is an appeal to the Scottish king. He is not even mentioned in Marshak's version, and the title is simply translated "Брюс-Шотландцем" (Bruce – to Scots). The very first line "Scots, Wha hae" was not translated at all. In the 13–14 lines "Wha for Scotland's king and law/Freedom's sword will strongly draw" the word "Scotland" was replaced with "родина" (homeland) and "king" was deleted.

Кто за родину свою	*Who wants to die in the fight*
Хочет жить и пасть в бою	*For the homeland.*
(Marshak: 14–15)	

This deletion obscured the main point of the historical events echoed in the poem; not to mention that the structure of the first two lines suggests that Wallace and Bruce were the same person. The same confusion appears in the translation of the poem "Farewell to our Scottish Fame".

Another example appears in the poem "O Wert Thou in the Cauld Blast" in the last stanza.

An attempt was made to erase potential monarchist overtones, and the words "monarch", "crown", "reign", "jewel" and "queen" were deleted.

Or were I monarch o the globe,
    Wi thee to reign, wi thee to reign;
The brightest jewel in my crown,
    Wad be my queen, wad be my queen.
(Burns: 13–16)

И если б дали мне в удел	*If I was given*
Весь шар земной, весь шар земной.	*The whole globe, the whole globe,*
С каким бы счастьем я владел	*I would be happy if I owned*
Тобой одной, тобой одной	*Only you, only you.*
(Marshak: 13–16)	

In the poem "A Dream", Marshak decided to erase the ironical addresses on the part of the poet, including "Your Grace", "Your Kingship", "my sovereign King" and "My sure".

Similar changes occurred in the translation of the poem "Bonie Laddie, Highland Laddie". The lines "For freedom and my King to fight" (15) were translated "За свободу и народ" / To fight for freedom and people". The word "king" was also deleted from the lines,

And for your lawful King his crown,
Bonie, Highland laddie
(Burns: 23)

Честь добудь себе в бою	*So bring glory to your country in fight*
Славный горский парень!	*Good lad from the mountains.*
(Marhsak: 26–27)	

As you can see, Marshak did not make a clear distinction between Highland and Lowland, translating Highland laddie as "good lad from the mountains" and Lowland lassie as "the child of the fields".

Adaptation of erotic connotations in Burns's poetry

Any reader of Burns knows that he holds a woman's physical love to be one of the best consolations in life. His poetry is full of erotic allusions referring to sexual intercourse, containing plausible metaphors for sexual organs, and speaking of sexual stimulation (Prandi 2006: 155–156).

The censorship of erotic elements had much in common with the censorship of swearwords and vulgarisms in Soviet discourse. A great deal depended on the judgment of an individual censor. However, proletarian literature was not the place for a demonstration or discussion of sexual themes. Hence, Marshak carefully avoided mentioning anything which may have disturbed Soviet censors.

There are numerous examples of softening erotic connotations in Marshak's translations. Thus, in the poem "I'am o'er Young to Marry Yet" a young girl complains that she is too young to be married. All hints at the sexual relationship with the future husband, the girl's main concern, "lying in a man's bed" (3), "And you an' I in ae bed" (17), were replaced with the girl's fear of staying alone with her future husband ("остаться наедине") or simply omitted.

In the poem "The Ploughman", the ploughman's girlfriend says: "I will mak my Ploughman's bed,/And chear him late and early" (16–17). Such an immoral statement was carefully replaced, and in the Russian translation she simply admires "her dear friend" and does not mention bed at all. In the previous stanza the girlfriend also dares to say "Cast off the wat, put on the dry,/And gae to bed, my Dearie" (11–12). In order to avoid any misunderstanding about the relationship between the ploughman and his girlfriend, Marshak replaced her invitation to bed by an invitation to dinner.

Marshak faced the same problem in the poem "My Collier Laddie" which was translated "Подруга угольщика" (The friend of collier). The change of the title stresses the main idea of a young woman who shares her life with a poor collier. The Russian word "подруга" used in the title does not necessarily suggest a romantic relationship and can be interpreted as merely "friend". Following the overall tendency of not mentioning personal names, Marshak did not translate the line in which the girl says that her name is Mistress Jean, "My name, she says, is Mistress Jean" (3).

In the fifth stanza a young woman describes how happy she is with her collier, "And make my bed in the Collier's neuk,/And lie down wi'my Collier laddie" (24–25). These lines could not be translated literally, so Marshak softened them, replacing "bed" with "my little corner" and erasing the words "lie down with wi' my". In his translation, the collier's girlfriend simply sits with her beloved every night in her little corner.

Я заберусь в свой уголок,	*I will sit into my little corner,*
Мой угольщик – со мною	*My collier – with me.*
(Marshak: 19–20)	

In the same poem the girl is offered "gay attire" if she leaves the collier, but her reply is that she would never leave her lover "Tho' ye had a' the sun shines on, / And the earth conceals sae lowly" (17–18). Marshak decided to concreticize the girl's reply by substituting "sun" with "mountains of gold" and "earth" by "pearls". Thus, the girl in his translation is offered all the gold in the world and perfect pearls but refuses to accept them. At the end of the poem, it is mentioned that the collier and his girl earn "five pennies in a day" (22). Marshak decided not to mention the earnings at all as it was improper to talk about earning and money in the Soviet Union. Private property and private income were on the lowest level of ideological values; everyone was supposed to care for the common prosperity first, while any desire for material goods was subjected to criticism and even disdain. For that reason, it was not ideologically acceptable for common workers personified in the poem to talk about their private income. The line "And the warld before me to win my bread" (31) was also omitted for the same reason.

It has been mentioned several times that Marshak often chose to intentionally intensify poor living conditions. This strategy can be observed also in the translations of those songs in which a young woman chooses a poor man over a rich one. The intentional intensification of the poor living con-

ditions in which a young woman chooses to stay with her beloved can be noticed in the translation of the poem "Country Lassie". After a conversation with her older neighbor who recommends thinking about wealth first when choosing a future husband, the girl says,

We may be poor, Robbie and I,
Light is the burden Loove lays on;
Content and Loove brings peace and joy,
What mai hae queens upon a throne.
(Burns: 37–40)

The girl goes into details in Marshak's translation, describing what kind of life she would have if she chose her poorer lover, mentioning a "miserable house", "empty barn" and "cramped stall".

Пусть мой удел – убогий дом	*Let my destiny be a miserable house*
Пустой амбар и тесный хлев, –	*Empty barn and cramped stall*
Вдвоем мы лучше заживет	*We will live together better*
Всех королей и королев	*Than queens and kings.*
(Marshak: 41–44)	

Otherwise, Marshak successfully rendered Scottish proverbs inverted in this poem: "It's plenty beets the luver's fire" (16) ("Love without landis is lyk a fyr without fewell"); "A hungry care's an unco care" (28) ("A fasting belly may never be merry") and "Syne as ye brew" (31) ("If ye brew weil you wil drink the better"). In this case, Marshak decided to use Russian proverbs to transfer the lyrical folk tone of the poem. By choosing slightly modified but well-known proverbs, Marshak saved Burns's original intention of stressing the main characteristics of the old woman's speech, such as colloquial simplicity and ingenuity.

It's plenty beets the luver's fire
(Burns: 16)

Где есть достаток там и лад	*Where is money there is peace*
(Marshak: 16)	

A hungry care's an unco care
(Burns: 28)

Полная рука сильней пустой	*The full hand is stronger then the empty*
(Marshak: 28)	

Syne as ye brew
(Burns: 31)

И уж какой ты сваришь мед такой и будешь пить сама. (Marshak: 31)	*You will drink the hone* *Which you have made yourself*

On the whole, Marshak succeeds in preserving the ironic, colloquial speech of the old lady by inventing old-fashioned Russian equivalents which render the speech colloquial, lower-class Russian.

Numerous examples of softening of romantic context can also be found in other translations of Marshak. Thus, in the poem "A Red, Red Rose", the expression "my Dear" used three times in the original was omitted or, in one case, replaced by "мой друг" (my friend).

In the poem "Kissin' my Kattie", the last two lines were completely written,

Drucken or sober, here's to thee, Katie,
An blest be the day I did it again!
(Burns: 15–16)

Что милей человеку на свете, Чем свобода, покой и любовь (Marshak: 15–16)	*What is better for the man in the world* *Than freedom, rest and love.*

In Burns's poem "Meg o' the Mill", the famous Scottish tradition of bedding the bride and the groom is mentioned, "O, ken ye how Meg o the Mill was bedded?" (13). Translating these lines Marshak avoided mentioning "bed" and simply asked his readers "А знаешь чем кончилось ночью веселье?"/ Do you know what was at the end of the joy.

In the poem "What Can Lassie do Wi' an auld Man", Marshak did not translate the lines "He hums and he hankers, / He frets and he cankers, /I never can please him / Do a' that I can" (17–20).

In the poem "The Lass That Made the Bed to Me", Burns describes the beauty of a young woman,

Her bosom was the driven snaw,
Twa drifted heaps sae fair to see;
Her limbs the polish'd marble stane,
The lass that made the bed to me! (33–36)

Marshak translated the first two lines but erased the third in which "limbs" are mentioned.

In "Jolly Beggars" the word "doxy" in the line "His doxy lay within his arms" (18) was substituted with "любовница" (lover). Translating the second song (tune – "Sodger Laddie"), in which a prostitute discusses her life, Marshak had to be particularly careful. Instead of saying that "one of a troop of Dragoons was my daddie", he mentions that a woman's mother was once a guest in the troop of dragoons. Even though it is clear what type of guest is referred to, Marshak's translation is much softer than the original. The woman mentions in the following lines that the first of her lovers was "a swaggering blade". Instead of the word "lover", Marshak used the word "друг" (friend), while substituting the line "Transported I was with my sodger laddie" with "Что таить! Я влюбилась в красавца солдата" / I will not conceal, I fall in love with a handsome soldier. Thus Marshak creates an almost romantic atmosphere by using the words "love", "handsome" and "conceal" in what was originally meant as the confession of a prostitute. Translating the next line "But the godly old Chaplain left him in the lurch", Marshak uses the verb "соблазнить" (to seduce), softening the whole context of the original statement that a woman changed one lover for another.

Much of the second half of the poem "Epistle to Davie" deals with the consolation love provides. While speaking of the effect the thought of his Jean has on him, Burns uses several expressions which reiterate the physical warmth that is a token of sexual arousal. Marshak decided to replace the verbs "to heat" and to "beet" with "to warm" and to "light" and erase the word "flame". Instead of the passionate "it sets me a'in flame", Marshak uses the expression "I am not alone any more".

It warms me, it charms me
To mention but her name:
It heats me, it beets me,
And sets me a'in flame!
(Burns: 109–12)

Довольно, невольно,
Мне вспомнить имя Джин,
Тепло мне, **светло мне**,
И я уж **не один**
(Marshak: 109–12)

It is enough for me to remember
The name of Jean unwillingly
*And I **feel warm** and **light***
*And I am **not alone** any more.*

At the end of this chapter, I wish to say a couple of words about the role of commentaries and prologues in Soviet discourse as they constituted an important factor in the interpretation of Burns's poetry. The critics' mission in connecting the author and the reader was as important as the translators'. Burns's enormous popularity in Russia (more than one million books published) attracted many critics who praised the poet and interpreted him according to established political and ideological canons. The required exactness of the commentaries demanded from critics a careful choice of information. Often such commentaries did not clarify poetic aspects, but were aimed instead at explaining the purely ideological features of the poems.

However, some exceptions existed: the so-called 'elite' series, which were written for a small circle of professors and researchers. More liberality in writing came to be allowed at the end of the communist regime in 1980. In 1982 a book of Burns's poems was published by Raduga (a publishing house). Both the originals and the translations were given in this book.[79] Instead of a commentary, an epilogue by Yuri Levin, a famous specialist in English literature, about the history of Burns's translations in Russia was included.

A very interesting comment, included in the same edition of 1982, was written by Arinshtain, a professional philologist. He analyzed Marshak's translations and came to the conclusion that Marshak had misinterpreted many poems, especially those that contained religious images. An interesting example can be found in the poem "Tam O' Shanter":

> That at the L-d's house, even on Sunday,
> Thou drank wi' Kirkton Jean till Monday
> (Burns: 27–28).

Arinshtain commented that Kirkton Jean, mentioned in the poem, was the owner of a little tavern. This tavern had a shady reputation, and the peasants sarcastically called it "Laddies' House". Burns used an ironic wordplay and shortened "Leddies' House" to "L-d's house" – similar to "Lord's House" – in the eighteenth century. Even later it was forbidden to publish the word "Lord" and only "L-d" was used. This little trick cheered up those who knew the point of it, but it unfortunately misled Marshak. He translated "The L-d's house" as "the House of the Lord" meaning "the church"

[79] Robert Burns: *Stihotvoreniia*. [Poems]. Moskva, Raduga. 1982.

and had to introduce images of the priest and the sexton which were not present in the original. Tam O'Shanter in Marshak's translation came to the church every Sunday and got drunk with the priest and the sexton. In the original, Burns blamed Tam for visiting the "Laddies' House" (meaning 'the tavern') and getting drunk there instead of going to church.

Arinshtain's comments contained interesting historical and biographical facts: the connections of Burns's poetry with literary and folk traditions and numerous allusions that allowed the reader to situate Burns' poetry in the context of European literature. Arinshtain also emphasised Burns's education and mental outlook and presented him from a completely different point of view: as a broad-minded, intellectual person and not as a common peasant who was born with the ability to write poetry and did not have to lift a finger to learn anything about it. Soviet critics had always stressed Burns's originality and never mentioned any educational institution he might have attended. It was true that Burns did not come to education very easily, but he certainly possessed a great talent for writing and also for appreciating the emotional and mental experiences of his precursors and contemporaries. Contradicting the Soviet portrait of Burns as a common peasant, Arinshtain presented him as an educated poet who possessed a good knowledge of history, geography and philosophy and could converse with the most highly educated professionals. He pointed to the influence of other English and Scottish poets on Burns's poetry. Analyzing one hundred and eighteen poems, Arinshtain pointed out more than three hundred allusions and paraphrases. In the poem "The Cotter's Saturday night" the critic found five concrete references to Pope, Goldsmith, Thomson, Grey and Fergusson. We can notice thematic and genre traditions in his poems, especially in his elegies and descriptions of landscapes, for example, "elegy on death" – from "The Life and Death of Habbie Simon" (Sempill, 1595–1659) and "The Last Dying Words of Bonnie Heck'" (Hamilton of Gilbertfield, 1665–1751) to "An Elegy on John Comper' (Ramsey) and "An Elegy on Professor Gregory (Fergusson). Besides the common theme and poetical clichés, they also have the same meter and strophe with a stable rhyme (587–588). These connections were a hard blow for those critics who stressed Burns' dependence on folk tradition and folk songs.

In Arinshtain's comments we can also notice the continued notion of Burns's references to the Bible, the gospels and to his frivolous texts. In delivering various contradictory aspects which were ignored in the Soviet interpretations, Arinshtain makes his main point that Burns's poetry did

not come into existence in complete isolation, but had been developing in a cultural space. It is clear that Arinshtain's intention was to offer the readers a different image of Burns, whose personality happened to be not as simple and narrow as had been described by Soviet critics. This was the first step in the liberal democratic ideology which, after 1980, replaced communism.

Was there anyone else?

Marshak unintentionally caused a serious problem for further generations of Russian translators of Robert Burns. Attempting to avoid comparison with Marshak's translations, which were often called 'a second original', and wishing to reach Marshak's level, a new generation of translators was induced to use different techniques and search for alternative translation methods. It was a difficult task, as to learn from a master always means to compete with him. These words were prophetic for those translators who wanted to follow Marshak.

In the Soviet Union, one of the first translators who risked competing with Marshak was Fedotov, who translated over two hundred of Burns's poems, mostly songs, and collected them in two books. Even though the book of his translations was published in the Soviet Union (1963), no positive responses were published in the major Soviet literary journals, dominated by Marshak's admirers.

Fedotov's main intention as a translator was to stress the folk spirit of Burns's poems. For that reason, following examples of Russian translators from the nineteenth century, he turned to traditional folk forms, style, rhythm and images taken from Russian folk songs[80] (bylina), including common epithets such as "удалец-молодец" (a brave man) and repetitions. For that reason perhaps, Fedotov concentrated mainly on songs and ballads, describing Scottish customs and rituals: "O that I had ne'er been Married", "Ye hae Lie Wrang, Lassie", "The Lazy Mist", "Halloween" (translated by Fedotov as "святки" – in Russia two weeks after Christmas, the time for divinations). To explain such a choice we have to look back at Fedotov's

[80] The founder of this tradition, which was oriented to folklore in Russian poetry, was Sergey Esenin.

origins. Born into a family of peasants and brought up in the country, Fedotov was naturally interested in folk traditions and customs from his youth.

The main problem with Fedotov's translations was that following the tradition of Mikhail Mikhailov, he decided to replace most typically Scottish cultural items with Russian ones. Obviously, Fedotov intended to provide a translation that conveyed to the reader that elusive thing which we despairingly call the 'spirit' of a work. This involved seeking to create in the target language some equivalent to language-specific word plays found in the original, even if this necessitated choosing words which were not literal equivalents of the words found in the original text.

For example, the title of the poem "Halloween" was translated "святки" (a typical Russian religious holiday), "pennies" – "грошики" and "копейки" (116) (Russian expressions for small coins), "lad" – "парнишка" (young man) (124), "destiny" – "судьбинушка" (159) (diminutive of destiny), "miles" – "версты" (Russian measure of length) and so on. The rhythm and the meter were also accommodated to folk poetry. All this Fedotov did in an effort to make it easier for the intended reader to feel the melody of Burns's original folk style and to reveal a pleasant picture of the Scottish country world with the help of lively dialect speech. The problem is that these very elements that make Burns's poetry unique are the things that are most difficult to adequately convey in a translation.

After all, Fedotov's translations were acknowledged to be interesting, but he was criticized for the Russification of Burns and for mixing Russian and Scottish folklore, which resulted in a strange mix of Russian-Scottish. It may have been better if Fedotov had completely transformed Burns's ballads and songs according to the Russian folk tradition and not leave any place for Scottish customs. However, in the same line with the typical Russian folk dance "хоровод" and the typical drink "самогон" appear "villains", "fairs" and "nymphs".

Fedotov also sought to 'translate' the situation of the poems into one familiar to Russian readers. This mixing of traditions caused an unintentionally humourous effect. For example, the poem "Halloween" ('святки' in the translation) contained lines about peasants who gathered the rye and celebrated the whole night. Halloween is celebrated at the end of October, so these lines in Burns's original are correct. However, Russian 'святки' is celebrated at the end of December and the reader can hardly imagine Scottish peasants gathering the rye at that time. As a matter of fact, in Fedotov's

translation the peasants gather cabbage instead of rye. When in Burns's poems the Protestant pastor appeared, Fedotov called him "батюшка" (129) (typical only of the Orthodox church), establishing an Orthodox church in Protestant Scotland. Scots in Fedotov's translation sing an old Russian prayer "Боже царя храни" (God, save our tsar) (124).

Sometimes Fedotov did not quite understand the original, and this influenced his translation. For example, in the poem "Does Haughty Gaul", Burns asked all Scots to unite with the English in the face of danger. Fedotov translated this as if Burns had called on the Scots to unite with each other. In the same poem the figure of the Russian tsar appears. In the poem "Halloween" he translated the words "charms" and "spells", which were used in the original to mean "fore-telling" and "exorcism", as "charming and delightful", transforming them into metaphor. "Sprightly coursers" which are ridden by fairies in the poem were replaced by "an outstanding light".

Such incorrect translation of the key expressions misrepresents the meaning of the poem. In Fedotov's translations Burns turned into an admirer of folk life and everything connected with it, and the creator of a miracle, fairy-tale-like world of a wild country, Scotland.

Nevertheless, Fedotovs's translations, practically ignored by Soviet critics, offered a basis for other attempts to use Russian dialects in translations of Burns's poetry. Many critics followed his pattern and tried to translate Burns with the help of Russian dialects and to adapt his poetry to Russian folklore.

The poem "The Jolly Beggars" was one of countless attempts by Soviet translators to come as close as possible to the original. The original poem was full of rude dialect words and the translators tried not to lose this feature. One of them, Sergey Petrov, took a risk in using Russian swearwords in the translation and succeeded. His translation was very close to the original and expressed the sharpness and vulgarity of the Beggars' speech. Unfortunately, it was not allowed to be published because it was deemed unacceptable for Soviet readers.

The first attempts of the modern translators to 'beat' Marshak were not successful, but not because they were unprofessional. They were just too daring for their time and were not accepted by the Soviet literary system.

Following the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, the process began of establishing a new interpretation of culture and literature. This new independence had profound effects on Russian literature. On the positive side, writers were now free to write as they pleased and about what they pleased without fear of reprimand or prison. They now had open access to foreign literature and the possibility of publishing their writings abroad. However, there were also negative repercussions to the new freedom.

The absolutely monopoly of Marshak's translations and his whole concept of Burns's poetry were strongly criticized. Many translations by various poets that had been written before but could not be published became well known. The only problem was the new interpretation. In the time of the Soviet Union, a clear conception of Robert Burns's poetic heritage was formed and remained unchanged for many years. No alternative conception which could lighten other features of Burns's poetry (not just those which were acceptable for Soviet critics) existed, and readers continued to associate Burns with the old communist regime, old canons and old rules. This caused a process of negation and demythologization of Burns by new criticism which turned into total denial of Soviet culture.

The first book of Burns's poems in the post-Soviet era was published by Evgenii Vitkovsky, a talented translator who had no chance of being acknowledged in Soviet times. He belonged to a new generation of translators who possessed great erudition, but who had to remain in the shadows for many years creating alternative translations (also of Burns's poetry). Vitkovsky's idea was to offer an alternative variant to the canonical Soviet translations by Marshak. He wrote a prologue and commentary to the new book of Burns's poems in which he made an attempt to interpret the great Scottish poet differently and explain the ideological aspects of Soviet translation. An important role in the new interpretation of Burns's poetry was assigned to commentaries containing sources of Burns's quotations, epigrams and some historical facts which he had found in world literature and history and used for his own purposes. The Bible and literary works by English and European authors belong to such sources in the first place. This was the first step toward including Burns in the world cultural context and in resisting the official theory of Burns being 'a Scottish peasant' and 'a poet of the common people'. Vitkovsky, in his works, rejected any connection between Burns and folklore. He wrote that Burns merely tried to imitate folk songs but did not succeed very well. We have to understand that the main aim of Vitkovsky was to create a different image of Burns,

free of Marshak's stereotypes. He criticized almost all of Marshak's translations, stressing that Marshak changed and shortened Burns's poems as he wished and even changed the titles of some poems completely.

Breaking Marshak's monopoly, Vitkovsky included different translations from different periods of time, among them some by Olga Chiumina-Mikhailova, Tat'ana Shchepkina-Kupernik and some new ones by Fel'dman, Bolichev and Freidkin.

The main difference between those translators and Marshak was that Marshak used only literary language in his translations. He ignored dialect expressions which could normally have been translated into the Russian language. The new translators were somewhat shocked because of the sudden freedom of writing, and tried to develop a different style for translating Burns's poetry. In the first place, they stressed the meaning of dialect expressions and sometimes went too far in their attempts to achieve exactness in their translations. This means that they started using "street slang"; for example, in the poem "The Jolly Beggars", translated by Sergey Petrov, the poetic style was lowered by vulgar slang and taboo words, for instance "пердеть" (*to fart*), "шлюха" (*hooker*) and so on. Translators started using dialect phraseological expressions, but often they could not keep the rhyme and sometimes even mixed male and female genders (those expressions were archaic, and only a few authors knew how to use them correctly).

In translating the poem "What Can a Young Lassie do wi' an Old Man", Freidkin also lowered the poetic style, destroying the original humorous effect by using such vulgarisms as "старый хрен" (the expression is used in the meaning of "an old man," but the word "khren" is often used to designate the penis) and "дрочить" (a very rude expression for "masturbate").

Vitkovsky wrote that it was important to show Russian readers the 'real' Burns. To this end new methods were developed. The most interesting example of the new method of translating was the ballad "MacPherson's Farewell". Walter Scott wrote that Burns's "MacPherson's Farewell" was the best proof of his extraordinary ability to imitate the style of Scottish national songs. Marshak's translations also serve as proof of his ability to change the meaning of a poem by changing the main accents. Marshak made MacPherson a national hero; his MacPherson struggled against the king's power which had been based on lies and bribery. He reminds readers of the famous English hero Robin Hood, the protector of the poor. In the commentaries to the book of Marshak's translations, it was stressed that

MacPherson was a brave sailor whose courage and honesty could serve as examples for all those who wanted to struggle for democracy and equal rights.

In the new Burns translations by Russian authors, it was particularly emphasized that in Marshak's interpretations, a killer and robber was transformed into a national hero. To create a new image of MacPherson closer to the original, translators used one of the new methods. The speech of the hero became more vulgar, spontaneous and non-literary. Many dialect expressions were used to make clear the real image of MacPherson, a common robber who could not by any means have been aware of such high literary expressions as those which were given to him by Marshak.

The most popular translator of Burns's poetry after Marshak was Evgenii Feldman. He introduced progressive new methods of translating, among them grotesque exaggerations, swearwords and a stress on dialect which caused drastic disagreement with the original.

Conclusion

The main subject of this research, the correlation between literary translation and ideology, has recently become one of the most significant questions in the field of ideological influence on literature. In the course of the study, I showed how and to what extent different ideologies in Tsarist Russia and in the Soviet Union influenced the cultural process and, above all, how these influences were reflected in literary translations of Robert Burns and with what consequences.

The results of the research show that the role of ideology in literature, and especially in literary translation, is often more important than in other arts (e.g., music, architecture or sculpture) because of literature's material (language and its meanings), extension and cultural value. As the history of Tsarist Russia and the Soviet Union shows, literature and literary translation are often considered the most efficient artistic instruments of ideological influence.

Examples presented in the research reveal that ideological influence is especially strong and effective in literary translations because they represent one of the most common ways, sometimes the only one, of connecting and mutually informing divergent cultures. The ideology existing in a specific political system strongly influences its comprehension of foreign culture and literature, which the target reader can recognize mostly through literary translations. Thus, ideology constructs and leads target readers' conceptions and presumptions about the foreign cultural environment, which can be positive or negative, depending on the ideological purpose.

From the examples provided, we can see that the strategies applied by different translators when dealing with various aspects of Burns's poetry in different historical periods are not similar but depend on different political and social formations of the society in which the translations were produced.

The ideological translations of Burns made in the Soviet Union by Samuil Marshak and Tat'ana Shchepkina-Kupernik were entirely adapted to the ideological demands and had several important functions. First, they clearly presented norm and value descriptions which included promotion of official soviet doctrines according to the newly established canons. Second, these translations offered a clear goal-description, emphasizing the main goals of communist ideology, such as equality of rights, a prominent position for peasants and workers, promotion of world revolution and criticism of the monarchy and the bourgeoisie. Third, both translators created a model setting presenting Robert Burns as a model communist democratic poet whose example should be followed by others. Selective biographies also contributed to this goal. Finally, Shchepkina-Kupernik's and, especially, Marshak's translations defined his position and relation to other groups, which meant strict delineation into 'friends' and 'enemies'.

However, the undeniable literary quality of translations made in the Soviet Union, raises the question of the potential to combine literary value with purely ideological formations. We find intense efforts made by translators to preserve and even expand the horizons of the readers, to maintain a minimal cultural level and circumvent censorship. Thus, the first examples of ideologically influenced translations made by Tat'iana Shchepkina-Kupernik are of high literary value, and Marshak's translations have become canonical and remained the best translations of Burns for almost half a century. Marshak's flexibility and ingenuity in transferring a poetic work into a different language demonstrated his outstanding talent not only as a translator but as a poet who had mastered his native language. This ideal discouraged all other attempts, and the next generation of translators faced a hard task. The 'Russian' Robert Burns had been created by Marshak and no translator has so far equaled his success. There is a famous saying in Russia which I think well illustrates what Samuil Marshak did for the promotion of Burns in Russia: "We say Marshak and we mean Robert Burns; we say Robert Burns and we mean Marshak".

Works Cited

Nicholas ABERCROMBIE, Stephen HILL and Bryan S. TURNER, 1978: The Dominant Ideology Thesis. *The British Journal of Sociology*. 29, 2: 149–170.

Meyer Howard ABRAMS, 1999: Marxist Criticism. In *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7th ed., ed. M. H. Abrams, 147–153. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Adelina ADALIS, 1959: Narodnyi Poet (k 200-letiiu so dnia rozhdeniia R. Bernsa). [National poet (to the 200s anniversary of R. Burns)]. *Oktiabr'* 6: 132–138.

Vladimir ALEKSANDROV, 1936: Recenziia na Knigu R. Bernsa. Izbrannaia Lirika / Perevodi s Angliiskogo T. Shchepkinoi-Kupernik. [Review of the Book R. Burns. Chosen Lyrics. Translations of T. Shchepkina-Kupernik]. *Literaturnoe Obozrenie* 19: 24–27.

Louis ALTHUSSER, 1971 [trans. Brewster, B]: Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses. In *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, 127–189. New York: Monthly Review Press.

– –, 2001: Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses. In *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, ed. Vincent B. Leitch, et al, 1483–1509. New York: Norton.

Roman ALVAREZ and Maria Carmen-Africa VIDAL, 1996: *Translation Power Subversion*. Multilingual Methods Ltd: Clevedon/Philadelphia/Adelaide.

Lionel Milner ANGUS-BUTTERWORTH, 1969: *Robert Burns and the 18-th Century Revival in Scottish Vernacular Poetry*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.

Aleksander ANIKST, 1939: Robert Burns. *Molodaia Gvardiia* 4: 107–108.

– –, 1959. Narodnyi Poet. [National Poet]. *Izvestie* 12: 45–46.

Viktor BABINTSEV, 1996: Victor Serge – the Witness of Epoch of "Directed Literature". Censorship in Russia". *Proceedings of International conference*. Ekaterinburg: 85–91.

Brian James BAER, 2006: Literary Translation and the Construction of a Soviet Intelligentsia. *The Massachusetts Review* XLVII, 3: 537–560.

Mikhail BAHTIN, 1975: *Voprosy Literatury i Estetike* [Questions of Literature and Esthetic]. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaia Literatura.

Mona BAKER (ed.), 1998: *The Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.

– –, 1986. *Estetika Slovesnogo Tvorchestva*. [Esthetic of Literary Creation]. Moscow: Iskustvo.

Glynn BARRATT, 1972: *Ivan Kozlov: a Study and a Setting*. Hakkert.

Susan BASSNETT, 2002: *Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.

Susan BASSNETT and Andre LEFEVERE (eds), 1991: *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Cassell.

Susan BASSNETT and Harish TRIVEDI, 1999: *Postcolonial Translation. Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Ekaterina BELASHOVA, 1957: "Perevodi V. Kostomarova iz R. Bernsa" [Translations of R. Burns by V. Kostomarov]. *Nauchnyi Ezhegodnik* 29: 371–379.

Vissarion BELINSKY, 1954: Razdelenie Poezii na Rodi i Vidy. Sobranie Stihotvorenii Ivana Kozlova. [The Division of Poetry into Categories and Sub-categories. Poems by Ivan Kozlov]. In *Polnoe Sobranie Sochinenii* [Complete Works] T. 5. Moskva: Soiuz Pechiat'.

– –, 1954: Essays and Critics. In *Polnoe Sobranie Sochinenii* [Complete Works] T. 5. Moskva: Soiuz Pechiat': 51–68.

Elena BELYAEVA-STANDEN, 2002: Maintaining Cultural Identity in Translation Russian Literature in English. In *Mezhkulturnaja Komunikacija i Problemi Nacionaljnoj Identichnosti* [Intercultural Communication and the Problems of National Identity], ed. N. F. Ufimceva, 199–211. Voronezh: Voronezh University.

Ladislav BITTMAN (ed.), 1988: *The New Image-makers. Soviet Propaganda and Disinformation Today*. Washington [u.a.]: Pergamon-Brassey´s.

Aleksander BLYUM, 2003: *A Self-Administered Poison. The System and Functions of Soviet Censorship*. University of Oxford: Oxford.

Alan Norman BOLD, 1989: *Scotland: a Literary Guide*. Routledge: London.

Jeffrey BROOKS, 1994: Socialist Realism in Pravda: Read all about it! *Slavic Review* 53, 4: 973–991.

Mary Ellen BROWN, 1984: *Burns and Tradition*. Urbana: Chicago University of Illinois press.

Robert BURNS, 1996: *Selected Poems*. Penguin Popular Classics: London.

– –, 1993: *The Complete Poetical Works of Robert Burns*. James. A. Mackay (ed.). Alloway Publishing: Catrine

– –, 1973: *The Glenriddell Manuscripts of Robert Burns*. Wakefield: Hamden Archon books.

– –, 1959: *Catalogue of Robert Burns' Collection in the Mitchell Library*. Glasgow: Corp. Public library.

– –, 1978: *Robert Burns v Perevodakh russkih poetov* [Robert Burns in Translations of Russian Poets]. Moskva: Molodaia Gvardiia.

– –, 1936 [trans. Shchepkina-Kupernik, Tat'iana.]: *Izbrannaia Lirika* [Chosen Lyrics]. Moscow: Molodaia Gvardiia.

– –, 1959 [trans. Fedotov, Vladimir]: *Stihi i Pesni* [Poems and Songs]. Arhangelsk.

– –, 1982 [Different Translators]. *Stihotvorenia i pesni*. [Poems and Songs]. K.Atarova (ed.) Moskva: Raduga

– –, 1963 [trans. Marshak, Samuil]: *Izbrannoe v Dvuh Knigah* [Chosen Lyrics in Two Books] Moscow: Goslitizdat.

– –, 1976 [trans. Marshak, Samuil]: *Stihotvoreniia i Poemy: Shotlandskie Balladi* [Poems and Long Poems: Scottish Ballads. Moscow: Soiuz Pechiat'.

– –, 1982 [trans. Marshak, Samuil]: *The Poetical Works*. Moscow: Raduga.

– –, 1985. J. De Lancey Ferguson (ed.). *The Letters of Robert Burns*. Oxford: Clarendon press.

– –, 1928 [trans. Bagricky, Eduard]: *Jugo-zapad*. [South-West]. Moscow/Leningrad: Zif: 23.

– –, 1892–1897 [trans. Chiumina-Mikhailova, Olga]: *Stihotvorenia* [Poems]. Sankt–Petersburg: 153–163.

– –, 1898–1897 [trans. Fedorov, Aleksander]: *Stihotvorenia* [Poems]. Sankt–Petersburg: 171–178.

– –, 1829 [trans. Kozlov, Ivan]: C*el'skij subotnij vetcher v Shotlandii. Vol'noe podrazhanie R. Bornsu I. Kozloy.* [Saturday Evening in the Small Scottish Village; Free Imitation of Robert Borns by Ivan Kozlov]. Sankt–Petersburg.

– –, 1866 [trans. Kurochkin, Vasilij]: *Zbornik stihotvorenii* [Collected Poems]. T. 1. Sankt-Petersburg: 37.

– –, 1954 [trans. Lermontov, Mikhail]: *Sobranije Sochinenii v 6. tomah*. [Completed Works in 6 Volumes]. T.1. Moscow – Leningrad: 90.

– –, 1878 [trans. Minaev, Dmitry]: *Pesni i satira* [Poems and Satire]. Sankt–Petersburg: 94–103.

– –, 1937 [trans. Mikhailov, Mikhail]: *Stihotvorenia* [Poems]. Moscow: 87–90.

John CAIRNEY, 2000: *On the Trail of Robert Burns*. Edinburgh: Luath Press.

Maria CALZADA PEREZ (ed.), 2003: *Apropos of Ideology. Translation Studies on Ideology – Ideologies in Translation Studies*. St. Jerome: Manchester.

Gregg CAMFIELD, 1991: Sentimental Liberalism and the Problem of Race in Huckleberry Finn. *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 46: 96–113.

Catherine CARSWELL, 1951: *The Life of Robert Burn*s. London: Chatto/Windus.

Maria CEBRIKOVA, 1880: Robert Burns. *Mysl'* 3: 102–116.

Vladimir Chernukha, 1989: *Pravitel'stvennaia Politika v Otnoshenii Pechati 60–70-e Gody XIX Veka* [Governmental Politics on Print Works in the 60s–70s of the XIX]. Leningrad: Nauka.

Daniel CHANDLER, 2002: *Semiotics: The Basics*. New York: Routledge.

Maria CHUDAKOVA, 1988: *Zhizneopisanie Mihaila Bulgakova* [Biography of Mikhail Bulgakov]. Moscow: Kniga.

Olga CHIUMINA-MIKHAILOVA, 1896: Robert Burns. *Niva* 8: 483–490.

Robert CRAWFORD (ed.), 1997: *Robert Burns and Cultural Authority.* Iowa: University of Iowa Press.

Thomas CRAWFORD, 1960: *Burns (A Study of the Poems and Songs*). Edinburgh and London: Oliver&Boyd.

– –, 1979: *Society and the Lyric: A Study of the Song Culture of Eighteenth-Century Scotland*. Edinburgh: Scottish academic press.

Sonia COLINA, 1997: Contrastive Rhetoric and Text-typological Conventions in Translation Teaching. *Target* 9: 353–371.

Bernard COMRIE / Gerald STONE and Maria POLINSKY, 1996: *The Russian Language in the Twentieth Century*. Clarendon press: Oxford.

Paul CUBBERLEY, 2002: *Russian: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

David DAICHES, 1966: *Robert Burns*. New York: Macmillan.

– –, 1971. *Robert Burns and his World*. London: THames and Hudson.

Dirk DELABASTITA, 1993: *There's a Double Tongue. An investigation into the translation of Shakespeare's Wordplay, with special reference to Hamlet.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Jacques DERRIDA [trans. Hulbert, J.], 1979: Living on Border Lines. In *Deconstruction and Criticism,* 175–186. New York: Continuum.

– –, 1987: Le Retrait de la Metaphore. In: *Psyche, Inventions de l'autre,* 63–93. Paris: Galilee.

Hugh DOUGLAS, 1976: *Robert Burns – a Life.* London: Hale.

– –, 1998: *Robert Burns: The Tinder Heart.* Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing.

Terry EAGLETON, 1978: *Criticism and Ideology*: *A Study in Marxist Literary Theory.* New York Schocken.

– –, 1991. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. London: Verso.

Joel Warren EGERER, 1965: *A Bibliography of Robert Burns*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois univ. press.

Anna ELISTRATOVA, 1957: *Robert Burns. Kritiko-biograficheski Ocherk* [Robert Burns. Critical Biographical Review]. Moscow: Goslitizdat.

Nikolay ERMOLAEV, 1997: *Censorship in Soviet Literature 1917–1991*. Rowman& Littlefiled: USA.

Efim ETKIND, [trans. France, P], 1978: *Notes of a Non-Conspirator*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Itamar EVEN-ZOHAR, 1990: Polysystems Studies. *Poetics Today* 11, 1: 9–94.

Norman FAIRCLOUGH, 2002: *The Dialectics of Discourse*. Accessed March 6, 2003. http://www.geogr.ku.dk/courses/phd/glob-loc/papers/phdfairclough2.pdf

Norman FAIRCLOUGH and Ruth Wodak, 1997: Critical discourse analysis. In: van Dijk, T. A. (ed.): *Discourse as Social Interaction*. Thousand Oaks, USA: Sage Publications. 258–284.

Peter FAWCETT, 1998: Ideology and Translation. In. *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies,* ed. M. Baker, 106–111. London: Routledge.

Andrey FEDOROV, 1978: K Istorii Stanovleniia Teorii Perevoda v USSR [History of the Translation Theory in the USSR]. *Babel: International Journal of Translation* 24, 3–4: 144–149.

Helmut FELBER, 1970: Standardization of Terminology in USSR: A Cursory Review. *Babel: International Journal of Translation* 26, 4: 72–84.

Stanley FISH, 1980: *Is there a Text in this Class?* Harvard University Press: Harvard

Robert FITZHUGH, 1970: *Robert Burns: The Man and the Poet. Around Unvarnished Account*. Boston: Houghton Miftlin.

Michel FOUCAULT, 2000: *Power: the Essential Works of Foucault*. T. 3. New York: The New Press.

Maurice FRIEDBERG, 1962: *Russian Classics in Soviet Jackets*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Paul FRIEDRICH, 1966: The Linguistic Reflex of Social Change from Tsarist to Soviet Russian Kinship. In *Exploration in Sociolinguistics*, ed. S. Leiberson, 31–57. Bloomington: Ind. Indiana University Press.

Edwin GENTZLER, 2001: *Contemporary Translation Theories*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

John GERRING, 1997: Ideology: A Definitional Analysis. *Political Research Quarterly* 50, 4: 957–994.

Aleksander GOLIKOV, 1982: Shotlandskie Narodnie Pesni v Obrabotke R. Bernsa: Voprosy Iazika i Stilia [Scottish Folk Songs in Burns's Interpretation. Questions of the Language and Style]. *Analiz stilei v zarubezhnoi hudozhestvennoi i nauchnoi literatury.* [Analyses of Styles in Foreign Fiction and Scientific Literature] 3: 115–124

S. Michael GORHAM, 2003: *Speaking in Soviet Tongues: Language Culture and the Politics of Voice in Revolutionary Russia.* Illinois University Press.

Joseph GRAHAM (ed.), 1985: *Difference in Translation*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Tat'iana GROMOVA (ed.), 1995: "Tsenzura v Tsarskoi Rossii i Sovetskom Soiuze" [Censorship in the Tsarist Russia and in the Soviet Union]. In: *Materialy Konferencii 24–27 maja* 1993. Moscow: Rudomino.

Mikhail GUTNER, 1937: Recenziia na Knigu Bernsa, Roberta. Izbrannaia Lirika / Perevod s angliskogo T. Shepkinoi-Kupernik [Review of Robert Burns's book of Chosen Lyrics translated by T. Shepkina-Kupernik]. *Literaturnij Sovremennik* 9: 68–170.

– –, 1938: Robert Berns [Robert Burns]. *Literaturnia Gazeta* 45: 5–10.

Anna HAGSTROM, 2003–2004: The Catholic Church and Censorship in Literature: Books, Drama and Film. *Analytical Teaching* 23, 2: 147–156.

Malcolm B. HAMILTON, 1987: »The Elements of the Concept of Ideology.« *Political Studies* 35: 18–38.

Lorna HARDWICK, 2000: *Translating Words, Translating Cultures*. London: Duckworth.

Frances HENRY and Carol TATOR, 2002: *Discourses of Domination*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Anthony HEPBURN (ed.), 1959: *Robert Burns: Poems and Selected Letters*. London-Glasgow: Collins.

Theo HERMANS, 1999: Translation and Normativity. In *Translation and Norms,* ed. C. Schäffner, 50–71. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Hans HÖNIG, 1998: Positions, Power and Practice: Functionalist Approaches and Translation Quality Assessment. In *Translation and Quality*. Ed. Schäffner, Christina. 6–34. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

James HOLMES, 1988: *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Wolfgang ISER, 1978: *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimor: John Hopkins.

Ivan IVANOV, 1896: Robert Berns [Robert Burns]. *Russkaia Mysl'* 7: 44–65.

Hans Robert JAUSS, 1982: *Aesthetic Experience and Literary Hermeneutics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

– –, 1989: *Question and Answer: Forms of Dialogue Understanding*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Elena KALASHNIKOVA, 1966: Translation in the USSR. *Babel: International Journal of Translation* 12, 1: 12–15.

Nicholas KAROLIDES, Margaret BALD and Dawn SOVA, 1999: *100 Banned Books. Censorship Histories of World Literature*. New York: Checkmark Books

Christina KEITH, 1956: *The Russet Coat (a Critical Study of Burns' Poetry and of its Background)*. London: Robert Hale Limited

James KINSLEY, 1970: Introduction. In *Robert Burns' Poems and Songs,* ed Kinsley, J, 18–20. London New York.

Kenneth Porter KIRKWOOD, 1958: *The Immortal Memory of Robert Burns*. Ottawa: LeDroit.

Boris KOLESNIKOV, 1967: *Robert Burns. Ocherk Zhizni i Tvorchestva* [Robert Burns. About Life and Creative Work]. Moscow: Prosviashenie

Werner KOLLER, 1979: *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft*. Quelle & Meyer: Heidelberg

Mikhail KONASHEV, 1998: On Some Modern Theoretical Attempts to Reanimate Censorship in Russia // Varda Briviba, Cenzura, Bibliotekas. *Konferences Materialu Krajums*. Riga: 185–194.

– –, (ed.). 1995: *Na Podstupakh k Spetskhranu* [Approaching Spetskhran] St. Petersburg.

– –, (ed.). 1995: *Tsenzura v Rossii: Istoriya i Sovremennost'* [Censorship in Russia: History and Modern Times]. St. Petersburg.

M. M. KOVALEVA, 1995: Rossiiskaya Tsenzura v Periody Glasnosti [Russian Censorship in the Periods of 'Glasnost']. In *Censorship in Russia: History and Modernity*. St. Petersburg: 23–24.

– –, 1996: Tsenzura i Sredstva Massovoi Informatsii – Tsenzura v Rossii. [Censorship and Mass Media – Censorship in Rusiia]. In. *Proceedings of International Conference Held in Ekaterinburg 14–15 November 1995*. Ekaterinburg: 9.

Gunthers KRESS, 1990: Critical Discourse Analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 11: 84–97.

Petr KROPOTKIN, 2004: *Ideals and Realities in Russian Language*. Whitefish: Kessinger Publishing.

David LAING (ed.), 1985: *Early Popular Poetry of Scotland and the Northern Border*. London: Reeves and Turner: 64–66.

Andre LEFEVERE, 1992: *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge.

– –, 1977: *Translating Literature: The German Tradition. From Luther to Rosenzwei.* Assen and Amsterdam: Van Gorcum.

Lauren Gray LEIGHTON, 1991: *Two Worlds One Art: Literary Translations in Russian and America*. De Kalb. Northern Illinois: University Press.

Yuri LEVIN, 1985: *Russkie Perevodchiki XIX Veka* [Russian Translators of the XIX Century]. Leningrad: Nauka.

– –, 1994: English Literature in Eighteenth Century Russia. *The Modern Language Review* 89, 4: xxv-xxxix.

– –, 1993: *Russian Shakespear Translations in the Romantic Era*. John Benjamins Publishing Co: Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Maurice LINDSAY, 1980: *The Burns's Encyclopedia.* New York: St. Martin's press.

– –, 1954. *Robert Burns: the Man, his Work, the Legend*. St. Martin's: London.

A. Donald LOW, 1975: *Critical Essays on Robert Burns*. London: Routledge.

Lev LOSEFF [trans. Bobko, J.], 1984: *On the Beneficence of Censorship: Aesopian Language in Modern Russian Literature*. Munich: Sagner.

Yuri LOTMAN, 1994: *Lekcii po Struktural'noi Poetike* [Lectures on Structuralist Poetics]. Moscow: Gnozis.

György LUKÁCS, 2001: Realism in the Balance. In *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism,* ed Vincent B. Leitch, 1033–1058. New York: Norton.

– –, 1972. The Ideology of Modernism. In *Twentieth Century Literary Criticism,* ed. Lodge. D, 484–502. A Reader: Longman.

Allen LUKE, 1997: Theory and Practice in Critical Science Discourse. In *International Encyclopedia of the Sociology of Education*, ed. Saha, L. Accessed March 6, 2003. http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/courses/ed253a/Luke/SAHA6.html

Leonid MAKUSHIN, 1996: Tsenzura v Preddverii Politicheskikh Reform 60-kh Godov XIX Veka. – Tsenzura v Rossii [Censorship on the Threshold of Political Reforms of 60s in XIX Century]. In *Proceedings of International Conference Held in Ekaterinburg 14–15 November* 1995. Ekaterinburg: 48.

Nadezhda MANDEL'SHTAM, 1974. *Hope Abandoned: A Memoir.* Collins & Harvill Press: London, 1974: 412.

Karl MARX, and Friedrich ENGELS, 2001: *The German Ideology Part One, with Selections from Parts Two and Three, together with Marx's 'Introduction' to a Critique of Political Economy.* New York: International Publishers.

Rachel MAY, 1994: *The Translation in the Text. On Reading Russian Literature in English*. Northwestern U.P.: Evaston, Ill.

Carol MCGUIRK, 1985: *Robert Burns and the Sentimental Era.* Athens: U of Georgia P.

Liam MCILVANNEY, 2005: Hugh Blair, Robert Burns, and the Invention of Scottish Literature. *Eighteenth-Century Life* 29, 2: 25–46.

Michael MEERSON-AKSENOV and Boris SHRAGIN, 1977: *The Political, Social and Religious Thought of Russian "Samizdat"*. Belmont: Nordland Publishing Company.

Janez MENART (trans.), 1975: *Burns*. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.

Mikhail MOROZOV, 1954: *Robert Burns. Izbranniyie Stat'i i Perevody* [Robert Burns. Chosen Articles and Translations]. Moscow: Molodaia Gvardiia.

David MURISON, 1975: The Language of Burns. In *Critical Essays on Robert Burns*, ed. Low, D., 54–69. London: Routlege.

Albrecht NEUBERT and Gregory SHREVE, 1992: *Translation as Text*. State University Press: Kent, Ohio, Kent.

Mette NEWTH, 2001: *The Long History of Censorship*. Accessed December 2008. http://www.beaconforfreedom.org/about_project/history.html

Ian NIMMO, 1965: *Robert Burns. His Life and Tradition in Words and Sound*. London: Record books.

Eugene NIDA, 1964: *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: Brill.

– –, 2001: *Language and Culture-Contexts in Translating*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Christina NORD, 1997: *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Christopher NORRIS, 1982: *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice*. London: Methuen.

Russell NOYES, 1994: Wordsworth and Burns. *PMLA* 59, 3: 813–832.

Aleksander OGNEV, 1988: *O Zanre i Stile Sovetskij Literatury* [About Genre and Style of Soviet Literature]. Kalinin State Univeristy: Kalinin.

Sergey ORLOV, 1939: *Berns v Ruskih Perevodah* [Burns in Russian Translations]. Leningrad: Kafedra vseobshei literatury.

– –, 1972: T. L. Shchepkina-Kupernik – Perevodchica Bernsa [T. L. Shchepkina-Kupernik – Burns's Translator]. *Sbornik Gorky* 3: 99–129.

Nikolay POLEVOI, 1989: Life and Poetry of Robert Burns. *Moskovskii Telegraf* 28, 14: 195–211.

– –, 1832: Literature in England at the Beginning of the XIX Century. *Teleskop* 7, 3: 415.

– –, 1837: John Barleycorn. *Biblioteka dlia Chtenia* 24, 2: 125–126.

– –, 1856: Translations of Robert Burns Made by Mikhail Mihailov. *Sovremennik* 57, 6: 229–236.

Julie PRANDI, 2006: Sexual Imagery in the Verse Epistles of Robert Burns and Anna Louisa Karsch. *Comparative Literature Studies* 43, 1–2: 153–170.

Aleksander RADISHCHEV, 1938: *Polnoe Sobranie Sochinenii* [Complete Works]. T.1. Moskva/Leningrad: 343–345.

S. Elsie RAE, 1960: *Poet's Pilgrimage. The Story of the Life and Times of Robert Burns*. Glasgow: Maclellan.

F. Thomas REMINGTON, 1988: *The Truth of Authority (Ideology and Communication in the Soviet Union).* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh press.

Steven RICHMOND and Vladimir SOLODIN, 1997: "The Eye of the State": An Interview with Soviet Chief Censor Vladimir Solodin. *Russian Review* 56, 4: 581–590.

David RICHTER, 1994: *Falling into Theory. Conflicting Views on Reading Literature*. Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press: Boston.

Trevor ROYALE, 1984: *The Macmillan Companion to Scottish Literature*. Macmillan reference books: London

Tine ROESEN, and Ingunn LUNDE, 2006: *Landslide of the Norm: Language Culture in Post-Soviet Russia*. Bergen: University of Bergen.

Arthur ROZEN, 1997: *Monarch Notes. »Madame Bovary«.* New York: Simon and Schuster Inc.

Maximilien RUBEL, 1957: Fragments Sociologiques Dans les Inedits de Marx. *Cahier internationaux de sociologie*, vol. XXII: 129.

John SALLIS, 2002: *On Translation*. Bloomington/Indianapolis: Indiana

David SAMPSON, 1985: Robert Burns: The Revival of Scottish Literature? *The Modern Language Review* 80, 1: 16–38.

Christina SCHÄFFNER, 2003: Third Ways and New Centers: Ideological Unity or Difference? In *Apropos of Ideology*, ed. Calzada-Perez, M., 1–9. Manchester: St. Jerome.

– –, 1998a: Action (Theory of Translatorial Action). In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, ed. Baker, M, 3–5. London: Rouledge.

– –, 1998b: Skopos Theory. In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, ed. Baker, M., 235–238. London: Rouledge.

SCHULTE, Rainer and John BIGUENET (eds), 1992: *Theories of Translation. An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Martin SELIGER, 1976: *Ideology and Politics.* London: George Allen and Unwin.

Irina SEMENKO, 1976: *Vasily Zhukovsky.* Boston: Twayne.

Harold SHUKMAN (ed.), 1982: *Cambridge Encyclopedia of Russia and the Soviet Union*. Cambridge, London, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mark SHUTTLEWORTH & Moira COWIE, 1997*: Dictionary of translation studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Matthew SIMPSON, 2003: Hame Content: Globalization and a Scottish Poet of the Eighteenth Century. *Eighteenth Century Life* 27, 1: 107–129.

Jeffrey SKOBLOW, 2001: *Double Tongue: Scots, Burns, Contradiction*. Delaware: University of Delaware Press.

Philip SMITH, 2001: *Cultural Theory: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Sydney Goodsir SMITH, 1954: Robert Burns and »The Merry Muses of Caledonia«. *The Hudson Review* 7, 3: 327–349.

Mary SNELL-HORNBY, 1990: Linguistic Transcoding or Cultural Transfer: A Critique of Translation Theory in Germany. In *Translation, History and Culture*, ed. Bassnet, S. and Levefre, A. 79–86. London: Pinter Publishers.

Mary SNELL-HORNBY, Franz PÖCHHACKER and Klaus KAINDL (eds), 1994: *Translation Studies: an Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Orest SOMOV, 1830: Obozrenije Ruskoj Slovesnosti za Pervuju Polovinu 1829 Goda. [Overview of Russian Literature for the First Part of 1829]. *Severnye Tsvety* 65: 1–67.

John SPEIRS, 1962: *An Essay in Criticism. The Scots Literary Tradition*. London: Faber and Faber.

Gavin SPROTT, 1996: *Robert Burns. Pride and Passion (The Life, Times and Legacy).* Edinburgh: HMSO.

George STEINER, 1975: *After Babel.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

D. Valeria STELMAKH, 2001: Reading in the Context of Censorship in the Soviet Union. *Libraries & Culture* 36. 1: 143–151.

Aleksander SHVAICER, 1987: Sovjetskaja Teorija Perevoda za 70 Let [Soviet Translation Theory in 70 years]. *Voprosy Jazikoznania* 5: 9–17.

Mark THOMPSON, (2002): *ICT, Power, and Development Discourse: a Critical Analysis*. Accessed March 6, 2003. http://www.jims.cam.ac.uk/research/seminar/slides/2003/030529_thompson_ab.pdf

Gideon TOURY, 1995: *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam.

Lev TROTSKY, 2004: *The Leon Trotsky: Internet Archive.* http://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/works/index.htm

Ivan TURGEENV, 1961: Polnoe Sobranie Sochinenii v 28 Tomah. T.2. [Complete Works in 28 Volumes] Moskva/Leningrad: 295–296.

Maria TYMOCZKO and Edwin GENTZLER (eds), 2002: *Translation and Power.* Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press.

A. Teun VAN DIJK, 1988: *News as Discourse*. Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum.

– –, 2000: *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Accessed March 6, 2003. http://www.discourseinsociety/OldArticles/The%20reality%20of%racism.pdf

– –, 1996: Discourse, Opinions and Ideologies. *Discourse and Ideologies*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters: 7–37.

Nina UTINA, 1876: Robert Berns: Shotlandskij Narodnyi Poet [Robert Burns: Scottish National Poet]. *Delo* 5: 179–234.

– –, 1876. Burns: *Delo* 5: 257–292.

Pavel VEINBERG, 1896: Robert Berns: Ocherk po Povodu Stoletnej Godovshini jego Smerti [Robert Burns: Contribution to the 100s Anniversary since Death]. *Ruskoe Bogatstvo* 9: 31–54.

Lawrence VENUTI, 1995: *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*. London: Routledge.

– –, 1992: *Rethinking Translation*. London: Routledge.

J. Hans VERMEER, 2000: Skopos and Commission in Translation Action. In *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Venuti, L., 221–232. London: Routledge.

Vladimir VINOGRADOV, 1978: *Leksicheskie Voprosy Perevoda Hudozhestvennoi Prozy* [Lexical Question of Translation of Fiction Prose]. Moscow: Moscow University Press.

Tat'iana VORONCOVA, 1981: Strukturno-semanticheski Analiz Balladi Roberta Bernsa "Dzhon Jechmennoje Zerno" [Structural-semantical Analysis of Robert Burns's Ballad "John Barleycorn"]. *Lingvostilisticheski analiz hudozhestvennogo teksta* 6: 20–26.

John C. WESTON, 1960: An Example of Robert Burns' Contribution to the Scottish Vernacular Tradition. *Studies in Philology*, 57, 4: 634–647.

George Scott WILKIE and James COSMO, 2002: *Understanding Robert Burns: Verse, Explanation and Glossary* (*Paperback*). Neil Wilson Publishing: Glasgow.

Kurt WITTIG, 1958: *"The Scottish Tradition in Literature*. Edinburgh: Mercat Press: 200–220.

Ruth WODAK (ed.), 1989: *Language Power and Ideology: Studies in Political Discourse* London: Benjamins Publishing Company.

Michaela WOLF, 2002: Censorship as Cultural Blockage: Banned Literature in the Late Habsburg Monarchy. *Erudit* 15, 2: 45–61.

Index

D

E

F

G

H

I

J

K

L

M

N

O

P

R

S

T

U

V

W