

Ideological Translations of Robert Burns' poetry by Tat'iana Shchepkina-Kupernik¹ in the Soviet Union

Natalia Vid , Faculty of Arts, University of Maribor

I. Introduction

Because ideology is one of the main cultural domains, the ideological approach in translation studies has recently drawn the attention of several researchers. Ideology, existing in a specific political system, strongly influences the comprehension 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 environment that can be positive or negative, depending on various ideological purposes. Exploring ways in which translation reflects power relationship within the cultural context, Andre Levefere 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".

When we speak about ideology in literature or in literary translations, we think about different moral, social and political concepts which an author or a translator consciously or subconsciously interlaces in his or her work and in this way models the reader's views, presumptions and expectations. A 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 in a literary work. Ideological influence does not contradict the essence of literature until the moment when this influence starts to dominate literary context or 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.

It is necessary to say that there has been practically no research which deals impartially with the meaning and characteristics of ideological influence on literature or literary translation during the communist era in the Soviet Union. The restrictions of the regime made it impossible to criticize the leading ideology. Studies done in the Soviet Union valued ideological influence as extremely positive. Western scholars did not pay much attention to this field either, because of the "iron curtain" which prevented them from gaining access to information and sources. In the late twentieth and early twenty-first century, after the fall of most totalitarian countries, including the Soviet Union, the situation has changed. More and more researchers have begun to investigate the question of ideological influence which defined culture and literature in the Soviet Union.

II. Socialist realism and its purposes

In order to understand the position of the Soviet translation school, it is essential to consider some important background. Only a few months after the October Revolution, the first demands were made that literature should be put in the service of communist ideology. The government took over printing presses, replaced writers' and musicians' associations with state-controlled unions, and shut down theaters and art studios.

Beginning in the 1930s, the communist regime regulated literary expression through "socialist realism"², an ideology enforced by the Soviet state as the official standard for art

¹ In this paper the ALA-LC (American Library Association & Library of Congress) type of transliteration of the Cyrillic alphabet into the Latin alphabet is used.

and literature³, which meant a system of strict rules about appropriateness and adaptation to the regime's demands. According to the new ideological propaganda, literary works were pronounced to extol the new, better lifestyle of communist society in the Soviet Union, to elevate the common worker by presenting his 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 the 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 (*predannost'*), "with all its religious connotations, was utilized at this time" (*Pravda* 8/24/34, quoted in Brooks 1994: 981).

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 now meant to be committed in public to promoting the Soviet project. The lead editorial in *Pravda*⁴ began on the opening day:

The country honors 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).

The First Soviet Writer's Congress completed the process of nationalizing literature begun 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 laboring people in the spirit of socialism (*Pravda* 1934: 5/6/34, quoted in Brooks 1994: 977)

² 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. In fact, Soviet sculpture suffered similar fatal violence. Immediately after the Revolution it worked out a special *Plan of Monumental Propaganda*, under which all statues of the tsars had to be demolished or taken away, with few exceptions. They were to be replaced by new monuments to the progressive leaders of the times according to a special approved list. Strangely, some very good monuments were erected in the first years of that "pilot-project", like the one to Timiryazev by Merkurov in Moscow. In general, Soviet sculpture aimed to glorify party leaders in the basic forms of socialist realism. Only World War II monuments show the true emotions of their authors and express the grief and glory of the nation.

³ Maxim Gorky, in his novel *Mother* in particular, was hailed as the founder of socialist realism, but officials also cited the works of other party-minded writers of the 1920s as examples of a correct socialist realist approach. Such works included *Chapaev* (1923; translated 1935) by Dmitry Furmanov, *Tsement* (1929) by Fyodor Gladkov, and *Razgrom* (1927; *The Nineteen*, 1929; also known as *The Rout*) by Aleksandr Fadeyev. The most notable of the works included in the canon of socialist realism was *Tikhii Don* (1928-1940) by Mikhail Sholokhov. This four-volume epic depicts life among 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).

⁴ One of the first and the most important Soviet newspapers.

Among other things, one of the most important aims of this program was to introduce to Soviet people foreign authors as supporters of the communist regime and offer them newly adapted interpretations of famous literary works.⁵ Soviet critics considered most world-famous artists to be spokesmen of the socialist regime. Their works had to be interpreted as communist manifests in which an individual's protest against capitalism was put in 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.

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. Writers⁶ and artists had to accept the metamorphosis of public discourse itself and were forced to work under strong pressure from the soviet communist regime. 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 or 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, quoted in Brooks 1994: 981).

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, hardly 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.

After the Revolution the foremost Russian artists were forced to emigrate. It was a great tragedy for national culture. 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 single attempt to change the direction of the main trend was suppressed and the guilty artist rigorously prosecuted.

III. Ideological translations of Robert Burns

It is interesting, even horrifying, to see how ideology exerts pressures on literary translation. A literary text undergoes a series of transformations or distortions depending on the stance or ideology of the author. This work is meant to highlight the dilemma that faces the translator when his or her ideology contradicts the author's or when he or she has to adopt techniques that are different from the author's. Such differences can be construed as deviation, changes or adoption of an ideology which is at variance with what the author

⁵ On the proposal of Lunacharski (the first "narkom prosvesheniya"), 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.

⁶ Samuil Marshak, Burns' most famous translator, was one of the first who adjusted himself to the regime's demands.

intends. Poems by the Scottish poet Robert Burns are a good example to show how ideology is compromised in literary translation for several reasons. First, Burns' translations in the Russian language are recognized as among the most successful translations of English poets in Russian and are still very popular among Russian readers. Second, the tradition of Burns' translations in Russia has never gained much attention among researchers. There are no literary analyses of the tradition of Burns' translations in Russian language, considering the influence of leading ideologies in Russian history. Finally, they offer a clear picture of ideological adaptation of literary texts.

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 earlier nineteenth century translations of Robert Burns could no longer fulfill the new aesthetic function of literature. New translations of Burns' 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' love lyric was translated; but his satires, his democratic lyric which contained appeal to the sentiments of freedom and citizenship, his patriotic songs and ironic epigrams remained unknown for Russian readers.

In 1930 Tat'iana Shchepkina-Kupernik (1874-1952), an outstanding translator of Byron, Shakespeare and Lope de Vega, became interested in Burns' poetry. Kupernik, as one of the most famous translators of European authors, based her credo on three principles of creative translation, very close to the modern translation theory: each translation should be considered as a valuable contribution to Russian culture; 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 understandable to the intended audience; in order to translate properly each translator has to be in perfect command of the language of the original which did not mean just understanding the words, but "feeling the spirit of the language and the original style of writing" (quoted 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 as the native reader was by the original. Such a translation was not purely a technical transferring from one language into another; but it 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 the form of the original in a literary language comparable to the original style.

To achieve this, each translator must be gifted in literary writing. Kupernik also insisted on the exact expression of the meaning; the form was of second importance. In her articles devoted to Shakespeare she stressed that the most important thing for the translator was to express the ideas of the author. This could be possible only if the translator understood the spirit of the language and could successfully reproduce the style of the author. Considering spirit and style completely different fields, Kupernik defines language as an extensive conception which included vocabulary and grammar whereas the style was described as a choice of words and expressions and their position as a reflection of author's mind (quoted 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' lyric poems which included translation of seventy-four poems and became the largest translation of Robert Burns in Russia made by one author. The translator presented different genres of Burns' poetry – political, satire, love lyric, songs and ballads - and translated poems which had never been introduced to Russian readers before, for example Burns' famous satire "Holy Willie's Prayer" and "A Poet's Welcome to his Love-begotten Daughter".

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

The poem is organized in the form of a dialogue between two dogs, one of which 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 is the claim that virtue does not depend on wealth and that peasants are 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 laborers in Scotland in 1780s, the poem possesses a certain documentary merit (1960: 173).

Considering the new ideological program, the main value of the poem was supposed to be a strict delineation into positive/negative, praised/despised society classes. Translating the part of the poem devoted to the description of live conditions under which dogs' masters must live, Kupernik used the strategy of substitution with a negative emphasis. Thus, when Caesar (the lord's dog) asks Luath about the conditions of his master's life, "what way poor bodies liv'd ava" (Burns, 1996: 50), Kupernik translated "I kak zhivut sred' nishchety" / *И как живут средь нищеты* (how to live in such misery) (1936: 50). By using the word "nishcheta", which has a stronger negative connotation than "poor bodies", as well as an archaic word "sred'"/*средь* (in), the translator intends to intensify poor conditions of the peasant's life. She renders the conversation between the dogs away from colloquial speech and emphasizes the seriousness of this statement.

The strategy of substitution with the purpose of domestication which implies that the relevant source text is replaced by the relevant target text item may be observed in the translation of the line "My Lord! Our gentry care sae little/ For delvers, ditchers and sic cattle" (1996: 89-90) into "dvorianstvo vidit skot v kholopakh/Chernorabochih, zemliakopakh"/ *Дворянство видит скот в холопах, чернорабочих, землякопах* (nobles consider their *slaves/workers* and ditchers as cattle) (1936: 89-90). In order to stress a negative attitude of the gentry towards peasants and workers, Kupernik invents the word "kholop"/*холоп*, 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. In this case Kupernik also domesticates the original, bringing it closer to Russian social background. The same strategy appears in the translation of the phrase, "An' what *poor cot-folk* pit their painch in" (1996: 69) which was translated "No chem *muzhik* nab'ët zheludok"/ *Но чем мужик набьёт желудок* (what the "muzhik" will put in his stomach) (1936: 69). In this case, the word "muzhik", with a degree of typical Russian colloquialism attached, contains the reference to a male with particular emphasis on low social level.

The strategy of deletion, meaning that the source text item is not rendered in the target text at all, as well as the strategy of substitution may be observed in the examples in which the word "Lord" appears, also in the meaning of the word "God". Both dogs use this word quite

often to express their astonishment or disbelief, but following ideological demands considering the status of religion, Kupernik deleted or substituted this word to erase any religious context. Thus, the 189 line “Lord, man” is translated “okh, batiushki”/оx, батюшки (o, my father) (1936:189). The colloquial phrase “okh, batiushki” has nothing to do with someone’s father in the Russian language but is used to express fear or astonishment. In fact, this substitution is successful because by rendering the expression into Russian colloquial speech, Kupernik ascribes more simplicity and directness to Luath’s statement. In the forty-sixth line the phrase “lords of the creation” (1996: 46) is substituted with “venec tvoren’ia”/венец творенья (garland of creation) (1936: 46). In this case the substitution is not as successful as the previous one because “venec tvoren’ia” is an often epithet in Russian poetry and sounds out of place in the prologue to the satirically coloured but friendly conversation. In the following line the phrase “Lord, man” (1996: 189) is translated as a typical communist slogan “Okh, brat!”/ ox, брат (oh, brother) (1936: 189), erasing the ironic response on behalf of Caesar which is so obvious in the original. In fact, Kupernik intentionally stresses 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. Thus, when Luath addresses Caesar as “Master Caesar” (1996: 185), Kupernik deletes the word “master”. The same thing happens in Luath’s phrase “guid faith” (1996: 159) which is substituted with rather unceremoniously, colloquial expression “eй, bros”/ ей, брось (hey, no way) (1936: 159).

Translating the word “priest” (1996: 119), Kupernik again uses the strategy of substitution with negative emphasis. “Priest” is translated as “pop” (1936: 119), which is an archaic word but has satirical and sometimes even contemptuous connotations in the modern Russian language.

The strategy of substitution with de-emphasis appears in the translation of the phrase “great folk's life's a life o' *pleasure*” (1996: 186), which is translated “zhisn’ bogacheй ves’ma priiatna”/ жизнь богачей весьма приятна (the life of rich people is pretty nice) (1936: 186). The word “pleasure”, which is invented to describe the unquestionable priorities of gentrified life, is replaced by the expression “pretty nice”, which deemphasizes the original idea.

The strategy of diminution is used in the 15th line which describes Caesar as a friendly and honest dog despite his belonging to the higher society level. The phrase “but though he was o' high degree” (1996: 15) is translated “no hot’ porodoй vrode lorda”/ но хоть породой вроде лорда (despite his breed which is close to the lord’s) (1936: 15), presuming that the word “breed” may be well used for a description of a human being if he or she belongs to the higher society level.

The strategy of generalization is used in the translation of the line “for Britain’s guide” (1996: 1480) in which “Britain” is replaced by “rodina”/ родина (homeland) (1936: 1480). Kupernik’s intention in this case is to accommodate Burns’ original to the situation in the Soviet Union, promoting him not as an exclusively Scottish but as an international poet. The same generalization occurs in the phrase “he was nane of Scotland’s dogs” (1996: 10), which is translated as “byl rodом iz chuzhikh storon” / был родом из чужих сторон (he was from foreign countries) (1936: 10).

The strategy of softening, often used in Kupernik’s translations of love lyrics, appears in the translation of the word “whoring” (1996: 217), which is translated “razvrat”/разврат (immorality) (1936: 217).

The translation of “The Cotter’s Saturday Night”, which reflects Burns’ sentimental manner, may also serve as a good example of ideological influence on the 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 enough (Crawford 1960: 174).

The poem is difficult to comprehend because of numerous echoes from older poets and familiar associations. Crawford (1960: 175-176) describes allusions to Gray, Goldsmith, Fergusson, Shenstone, Pope, Thomason, Gay, Milton, Collins, Young, Stern, and Shakespeare, assuming that the use of allusion and echoes are a consequence of the social nature of Burns' 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' contemporary readers, whereas there are few today who can recognize allusions to Milton or Stern without additional explanations.

The basic ideological strategy in the translation of the poem "The Cotter's Saturday Night" is the strategy of deletion, which allowed Kupernik to avoid numerous intertextual references to the Gospels. Thus, the line "For whom my warmest wish to Heaven is sent" (1996: 173) was completely deleted because of the word "heaven" as well as the lines 127 to 144 (fifteenth and sixteenth stanzas), which describe a family's prayers and include the names of Jesus, Babylon, Eternal King, Patmos, Christian, 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. In the fourteenth stanza, the name Moses was erased and King David was replaced by "car' pevec"/*царь-певец* (the king-singer) (1936: 111). These deletions and substitutions caused a drastic change in the meaning of the poem, which in the original proclaimed the beauty and sincerity of a true faith in comparison with constrained demands of the church. In Kupernik's translation this meaning was almost completely lost. 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 a negative emphasis, which in this case means the use of exaggerations, was used to intensify negative connotations of the luxury life of the nobles which appear to be more offensive than in the original. In the lines "And O may Heaven their simple lives prevent /From Luxury's contagion, weak and vile!" (1996: 171-172), the word "contagion" was translated "gnusnoe tvoren'e"/ *гнусное творенье* (an ugly creation), "weak" as "kovarstvo adskoe"/*коварство адское* (hellish perfidy) and "vile" as "porokov izvrashchen'e"/*пороков извращенье* (prevision of vices) (1936: 142-143). The lines "Disguising oft the wretch of human kind / Studied in arts of hell, in wickedness refin'd!" (1996: 176-177) were translated "da ne kosnëtsia ikh zarazy tlen'e, iad roskoshi, porokov gnusnyh gnoï"/ *да не коснётся их заразы тленье, яд роскоши, пороков гнусных гнои*. (May the infection of decay, the poison of luxury and the muck of disgusting sins never touch them!) (1936: 148-149).

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. In the very first line the addressee named "kind Sir" (1996:1) was deleted because Burns (in his Russian incarnation) could not address anyone above him with such respect, even if this respect was expressed ironically and introduced by a satirical note at the very beginning of the poem. In the third line the word "Sir" was replaced by "charodeï"/*чародей* ("a magician") (1936: 3). The strategy of softening (or probably just a misunderstanding) is obvious in the eighth line, "If Venus yet had got his nose off" (1996: 8), which gently hints at the emperor Fran Joseph's venereal disease, was translated "Venere v nos dobychu broshiv"/ *венере в нос добычу бросив* (he throw his win before Venera's nose) (1936: 8).

It is interesting to have a look at translations of love songs and poems made by Kupernik. Of course, any frivolous expressions and hints at sexual relationships, so common in Burns' lyric, were replaced with innocent kisses and "comradely" hugs. Eroticism in

literature and the arts was hardly suppressed by Soviet censorship. The intentional sentimentality of Kupernik's translations prevents Soviet readers from comprehending a lively, colourful, humoristic style of Burns' songs. Critics insisted on the importance of Burns' 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' poems, and each inaccuracy or overly "bookish" expression, which could be otherwise perfectly acceptable in the translation, was considered to be an "inadmissible falsehood".

For instance, in the poem "A Red, Red Rose" Kupernik used the word "nezemnoï"/*неземной* (celestial) translating the word "sweet" in the line "That's sweetly play'd in tune" (1996: 4). This word distorts 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 "svet moï edinyï" / *свет мой единый* (my only light) (1936: 13) instead of simply "my only Love" (1996: 13) and "prosti zhe" / *прости же* (forgive me) (1936: 14) instead of "fare thee weel" (1996: 14).

Translating the poem "Farewell to Eliza", Kupernik used the strategy of addition (invention). She invented the phrases "Eliza, drug moï nezhnyï" *Элайза, друг мой нежный* (1936: 1) (Eliza, my tender friend) as well as "drug serdechnyï"/*друг сердечный* (1936: 9) (the friend of my heart) in order to erase any hints at love relationships between the poet and Eliza. The line "My heart and soul from thee" (1996: 8) was translated as "moëi dushi s toboï"/ *моей души с тобой* (my soul with thee) (1936: 8), omitting the word "heart". In fact, the translation leaves the impression of devotion to Burns' sister or at least 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 thwithin my straining grasp/ The melting form of Anna" (1996: 11-12) the word "form" was substituted with the word "stan"/ *стан* (1936: 12), a poetical expression for a female figure, and instead of the word "grasp" the word "embracing" (1936:11) was used. The phrase "Yestreen I had a pint o' wine" (1996: 1) was translated "Vchera ia osushil bokal"/ *вчера я осушил бокал* (yesterday I drained my goblet) (1936: 1). The word "lips" (1996: 8) was translated as "usta"/ *уста* (1936: 8), a poetical expression for lips. The phrase "Awa, thou pale Diana!" (1996: 18) was translated "Diana, skroi svoï lik tumannyï"/ *Диана, скрой свой лик туманный* (Diana, hide your misty image) (1936: 18). In general, the frivolous poem was overwhelmed by poetic, sentimental expressions.

The translation of "To a Mountain Daisy" was acknowledged to be the most unsuccessful by Soviet critics, who otherwise praised Kupernik's ingenuity and poetical gift, and named it "exaggerated sentimentality". In the first part, Kupernik used many diminutives to express the pastoral-idyllic style and sentimentality of the poem, such as "tsvetochek"/*цветочек* (a diminutive of "flower"), "stebelëk"/*стебелёк* (a diminutive of "stem"), "glazok"/*глазок* (a diminutive of "eye"), "kamushek"/*камушек* (a diminutive of "stone"), "ugolok"/*уголок* (a diminutive of "corner"), etc.

Sometimes, however, Soviet critics were dissatisfied with the use of archaic expressions which were perfectly comprehensible for Russian readers. Thus, in the poem "Whistel and I Will Come to You My Lad" the expression "Tho' father an' mother" (1996: 3) was translated "batiushka i matushka"/*батьюшка и матушка* (1936: 3), an old-fashioned, pre-revolutionary expression for father and mother. For using this phrase, Kupernik was accused of appreciating pre-revolutionary norms and values. Marshak, who became the most famous Russian translator of Burns' 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 “otets i mat”/ *отец и мать* (father and mother).

There are some examples of a pure misunderstanding of the original by Kupernik. Thus, the last line in the poem “I hae a Wife o’ my Ain”, “If naebody care for me/I’ll care for naebody” (1996: 15-16), was translated as “Ne liubim ia nikem-ne beda/Ia i sam ne liubliu nikogo”/ *не любим я никем-не беда, я и сам не люблю никого* (nobody loves me – but this is not a disaster/I don’t love anyone as well) (1936: 15-16). In the translation of the poem “The Joyful Widower” Kupernik used the word “mavzolei”/ *мавзолей* (mausoleum) (1935: 18) translating the line “Her body is bestowed well/A handsome grave does hide her” (1996: 17-18). Considering the fact that the poem was supposed to reflect the feelings of a simple peasant, the word “mausoleum” appears odd and out of place. The translation also does not transfer the original humoristic effect of the word “handsome” applied to describe the grave of a woman.

V. Conclusion

It has to be appreciated that Kupernik presented a clear delineation between “friends” and “enemies” in her translations, which was very important for a new ideological literary program. Regarding the general characteristics of this division, we can see that the category of friends occupies a highly prominent position, while the “enemies” are often marginalized, underestimated, or simply deleted. In the category of “friends” belong common workers (peasants, sailors, soldiers and blacksmiths), optimistic, cheerful, honest and courageous, 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 colorful world of “common workers”⁷, full of simple happiness, hope, courage and struggle for equal rights (“Is there for Honest Poverty”, “John Anderson, my Jo” “Pegasus and Wanlockhead”, “Willie Brew’d a Peck o’ Maut”, “On the Saes and far Away”, etc).

In the category of “standard enemies” belong priests, monarchs, politicians (both British and Scottish) and aristocrats (even those who were among the poet’s friends). In this case Kupernik used a sarcastic, disregarded and highly humiliating glossary⁸, much more excessive than in the original poems.

In general, Kupernik’s translations were praised by Soviet critics for a successful transferral of Burns’ revolutionary and democratic ideas. Her greatest achievement was considered to be an understanding of Burns’ national spirit and her ability to comprehend and appreciate his optimism and faith in poor people. Using different translation strategies, Kupernik followed the main ideological demands, enforced by communist doctrine and succeeded in capturing the democratic, cheerful and folk style of Burns’ 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

⁷ Such 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”.

⁸ Such images were very frequent in Burns’ 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 created in the Soviet Union.

and peasants, both democratic and revolutionary, whose spirit remained unconquered despite historical repression.

List of Works Cited

Brooks, J. 1994. Socialist Realism in Pravda: Read all about it! *Slavic Review* Vol. 53, no. 4: 973-991.

Burns, R. 1936. *Izbrannaia Lirika/Perevody s Angliiskogo T. Shchepkinoï-Kupernik*. Moscow.

-----1996. *Selected Poems*. Penguin Popular Classics: London.

Crawford, T. 1960. *Burns (A Study of the Poems and Songs)*. Edinburgh and London: Oliver&Boyd.

Lefevere, A. 1992. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge.

Orlov, S. A. 1939. *Berns v Russkih Perevodah*. Leningrad: Kafedra Vseobshcheï literatury: 232-235.

-----1972. T.L.Shchepkina-Kupernik – perevodchitsa Bernsa. *Literaturnye Sviazi i Tradicii* Vol. 3: 99-129.