

DOI: 10.17516/1997-1370-0350  
УДК 821.161.1.035(=512)

## Polycultural Character of Translated Russian Literature: Yakut and Buryat Cases

Irina S. Alexeeva<sup>a</sup> and Albina V. Boyarkina<sup>b\*</sup>

*<sup>a</sup>Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia  
St. Peterburg, Russian Federation*

*<sup>b</sup>Saint Petersburg State University  
St. Peterburg, Russian Federation*

Received 09.11.2018, received in revised form 21.11.2018, accepted 26.11.2018

---

**Abstract.** The article looks into the polycultural aspects of ethnic literatures of Russia translated into the Russian language and analyzes the shift from the two-step translation method of 20th century to a new interactive model as a way to provide the mentioned polycultural quality. The authors start from the retrospective analysis of ethnic text traditions and compare it with new experimental data of Yakut and Buryat texts in Russian translations.

**Keywords:** interactive polycultural model, Russian language as a cultural mediator, ethnic languages of Russia, genres of ethnic literatures, translation strategies, Russian literary norm, illustrated commentary.

Research area: philology.

---

Citation: Alexeeva, I.S., Boyarkina, A.V. (2020). Polycultural character of translated Russian literature: Yakut and Buryat cases. *J. Sib. Fed. Univ. Humanit. Soc. Sci.*, 13(3), 327-340. DOI: 10.17516/1997-1370-0350.

---

*"I am speaking: translation is everywhere"*

**Natalia Avtonomova**

People predominantly read texts in their native language. The share of texts in foreign languages does not prevail over native texts even in the reading of philologists – specialists in other cultures. It refers to the texts of both everyday and literary character. Nonetheless we actively come into contact with texts from other cultures, and it happens due to the familiar mechanism – translation. The place of such texts in the general textual culture is quite specific, though obvious – it is another foreign literature. Yet there is not a single word written by a foreign author, everything is written by a translator from the culture of our own, and he relied on his own vision of the world and employed his own vocabulary and conceptual repertoire, his own understanding of language registers! On the other hand, there is a concept of “world literature” where works of literature in foreign languages are taken as parts of the whole, and the dichotomy “own” – “alien” is neutralized. The whole body of the world literature is constructed on the conceptual level, possesses theoretic conventionality, and has little reference to the crude linguistic matter. However, the texts conceived by the authors within a given culture must be different from the two-layered translated texts coming from other cultures, if only by the lack of double orientation and intrinsic secondariness. The phenomenon has long invited a thorough analysis.

The problem itself and the aspects of its analysis ask for a polydisciplinary approach embracing not only philological and cultural studies but also socio-cultural, ethno-historical, philosophical disciplines as well as legal documents. In their discussion of the need to preserve languages researches of polyculturalism (Zamyatin, Pasanen, Saarikivi, 2012; Koptseva, Bakhova, Medyantseva, 2011) stress its importance regarding it as a key to cultural well-being in the future (Alpatov, 2014; Galayeva, 2016; Kirko, 2015; Nesmelaya, 2016; Strizhevskaya, 2013, Razumovskaya, 2014 et al.), and the Russian legislation grants this opportunity (Federal Law, 1999; Strategiya

gosudarstvennoy natsionalnoy...; Silantyeva, Suntsov, 2016).

We will make an attempt to delve into the problem and analyze the possible solutions using literary translations in the cultures of the Russian North – Yakut and Buryat – as a study case.

### **The place of translations in the ethnic literature**

Foreign literary works are appropriated by the recipient literature through various strategies. A range of them has been in use since ancient times though a scientific description of them was undertaken not long ago. Amongst the multitude of terms let us mention several which stand out in the translation theory: “estrangement” method (Verfremdung) suggested by Friedrich Schlegel, German Kulturträger, who called for preserving the text’s national specificity in translation; strategies of “foreignization” (looking like “estrangement”) and “domestication” (the opposite process of adaptation to the receiving cultures suggested by an American theorist Lawrence Venuti (Venuti, 2008), and finally, a variety of methods under the umbrella term “cultural adaptation” (Mikhaylova et al., 2007 and others). Apropos, talking about “estrangement” we would like to dispute the view of V. Razumovskaya who dates the term back to V. Shklovsky (Razumovskaya, 2016 II: 114-116), who, as we think, was likely to have read F. Schlegel’s work mentioned above.

It is noteworthy that translated literary works can be used as models for creating literature in the receiving languages – so it happened in Ancient Rome with translations of Classical Greek comedies or lyrics and polyhymnias into Latin; so it was in Russia in the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century when Russian novels followed French patterns (M. Chulkov, M. Heraskov and others).

In other cases translations can be but a pale imitation, in which case they accentuate and throw into relief the quality of the recipient literature. For example, French translations of

F.G. Klopstock's odes proved the superiority of the French classical poetry in the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

Finally, the third variant – most widely spread and popular, it seems – is when the translated work enriches and complements the recipient literature and culture. In this case two seemingly opposite qualities of the coming literature are equally important: on the one hand, familiarity, closeness, usualness of the aesthetics, genre peculiarities, thematic or narrative patterns, on the other – novelty, strangeness, incomparability with anything familiar... While the former is important because the awareness of the cultural code creates the sense of kinship with a different nation and the entire human race, the latter is explained by the nature of art at large, including verbal art: it is alive and breeds new senses and forms without which people will not experience happiness at discovering new and beautiful things.

Allow us to make one more anticipatory remark. Genre variety, heterogeneous contacts, contribution to the world literature are often deemed the signs of development and richness of a given national literature. Can we assume then that Russian literature is more developed than Yakut, and French literature – more developed than Russian? Definitely not. No one can measure and compare the spiritual richness and the spectrum of feelings evoked by the native literature in the heart of the reader; no one can point to the trace left in the human life by a novella by Mopassant, or a fairy tale by Pushkin, or an Olonkho song.

### Specific features of Russian experience

The contacts between Russian culture and other ethnic cultures of Russia have a long-standing tradition, and in each case it was a multifaceted and educating story. As of today, there are twelve officially registered languages in the Russian Federation, and most of them make use of the Cyrillic alphabet borrowed from Russian (Pismennyye yazyki ... 2000, 2003; Ivshin, 2010). We cannot disregard this fact of cultural interaction. The mass transition of Russia's written languages to the Cyrillic alphabet, preceded by the pervasive Romanization in the 20s, took place in 1937-38. Thus, we can speak of the close contacts between the cultures of

Russia, and more often than not the new initiative in cooperation came from the Russian culture. N. Koptseva notices that in 1930 a third of all publications (counted in titles) in the USSR was done in the ethnic languages while in Tzarist Russia, which was no less multinational, 90% of publications was in Russian (Koptseva, 2017 II: 142-143). To be objective we have to point out that the Russian initiative was not always conducive to the maintaining of the written language and literature of the peoples of Russia, especially indigenous peoples. Thus, as V. Alpatov claims, when in the 30s the Roman alphabet was countermanded, and all languages of the USSR were transferred to the Cyrillic alphabet, about 12 small peoples of Russia lost their written language (Alpatov, 2014). Let us limit our observations to the material provided by the cultural events in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

While propagating their national culture, the speakers of other languages in Russia still create their literary works, including those based on folklore, in the Russian language. An epic example is the creative work of Kallistrat Zhakov, an outstanding philosopher and man-of-letters of the late 19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, representing Komi-Zyryan culture. K. Zhakov collected, reconstructed and wrote down in Russian *Byarmia*, the Northern epic of the Komi people (1916), which was back-translated into Komi only much later (translator M. Elkin, 1933) (Ostapova, 2017: 59). In reading *Byarmia* one is impressed by the merging of the folklore and the author's individual style, and this gives researchers reasons to call *Byarmia* a literary epic (see: Limerov, Sozina, 2014); in this quality it reminds the Finnish epic *Kalevala* by Elias Lenrott, published in 1835, which, however, was written in Finnish.

K. Zhakov's literary fairytales such as *The Golden Tale*, *The Silver Tale*, *Uriila* (Zhakov, 1990) are written in Russian and show the influence of the literary tales from the Silver Age in Russian literature. So we think that the polycultural approach to culture is manifested in the verbal component borrowed from the neighbouring language which linguistically serves this territory. In the analyzed case it is the Russian language, which explains why numerous cultural components – names, every-

day realia – are modified in accordance with Russian linguistic norms, and specifically poetic phenomena – rhythm, poetic foot, tropes, onomatopoeia and other poetic forms – are given Russian correspondents.

The above-mentioned sound of speech presents a cultural phenomenon in itself. The long history of communication among Russia's ethnic groups (and during the Soviet period even more so) suggests that every nation living alongside the Russian people and using Russian for different purposes has its own specific system of deviations from the Russian literary norm. These deviations are best noticed in the phonetic system which renders a certain aesthetic attractiveness to those who speak with a recognizable "Caucasian" or "Ukrainian" accent. A vivid example of such positive cultural connotation is the sound track for the cartoon *Gordy Mysh (A Proud Mouse)* based on the Ossetian fairy tale. It was made by the cartoonist N. Berezova within the Internet project *Gora Samotsvetov (The Mountain of Gems)* designed to acquaint children and adults with the folklore riches of the Russia's ethnic groups (See: Gordyy mysh, 2007). The main character not only has a name which breaks the grammatical norm of the Russian noun 'mouse' (being used as a masculine noun rather than feminine as the norm prescribes), but also has a recognizable Caucasian accent, as in fact have all other characters including the Moon and the Sun. This cultural version immediately attracts the wide audience as can be seen from the responses to this cartoon on Youtube.

The famous editor's office of Samuel Marshak is largely responsible for creating the algorithm of the cultural interaction between Russia's nations and languages and the Russian language and culture. In the 20-30s they created patterns for re-phrasing the national folklore, and especially ethnic fairy tales, into Russian. Apart from Chinese, Korean, Italian, Balkan tales, Marshak's editorial board and later his pupils in the publishing house *Detgiz* worked with the literary material of the peoples of the Russian North: Yakut, Chukchee, Yukaghir, Dolgan and other stories and tales. One of the first books of the Russian Northern folklore – *The Nenets Tales* – was published

in 1954 (Tereshchenko, 1954). The style of the Russian versions of the Nenets tales in this collection corresponds to the folklore tradition perfected in the translations of Oriental and Western fairy tales: fairytale word order, simplified syntax, archaic lexicon, conventional imagery, set patterns for the beginning and the end of the tale. Allow us to underline this: we deal with the phenomenon typical for the literary contacts between the ethnic texts and their Russian manifestations; we observe a two-level translation process when a translator's work (N. Tereshchenko) is complemented by the stylistic adaptation done by a professional stylist (Z. Zadunaiskaya) who brings the translation close to the genre norms. The purpose of this work is obvious: it is to make foreign texts closer to the Russian genre models, both originally Russian and translated into Russian from other languages.

The specific feature of the Nenets tales collection is its bilingual form. The adjacent positioning of the original and translated texts fulfills an important cultural and educating role: it strengthens the original written text as well as illustrates its appropriation by Russian culture. Such equality is a vivid example of polycultural approach now practiced by the publishing business.

Active work of philologists to record and translate the texts of Russia's ethnic groups ran parallel to translating Russian literature into ethnic languages of Russia. Following the research done by N. Koptseva, we can typify the following process: a researcher studies a language and works of literature in it (as shown in detail on the example of G. Vasilevich who studied the Evenk culture, Koptseva, 2017 II: 81-100), records the oral folklore, translates it into Russian, translates Russian literature into an ethnic language, writes himself as an author of literature and journalism in this language, teaches and edits local ethnic authors. This way G. Vasilevich prepared for the publication more than 16 books of translations from Russian into Evenk (eight in Roman alphabet and eight in Cyrillic): among them are works of A. Pushkin, I. Krylov, L. Tolstoy, and 14 publications of Evenk authors and 4 books of Evenk folklore and fairytales.

Anyway, in all scenarios of cultural interaction the Russian word had a dominating position both in the Soviet times and in the post-Soviet period, that is why we have to speak primarily about translated literature from the ethnic languages into Russian and the place they occupied in Russian literature. This allowed to accumulate a lot of experience in the following spheres:

- recording the national oral lore in Russian (*Byarmia*);
- translation into Russian followed by stylistic and literary adaptation (*The Nenets Tales*);
- translation per se (scholarly analysis and translations by G. Vasilevich).

### Genre interaction

The genre variety of every literature often depends on what works of other literatures it appropriated and in what number. Our research has shown that the most popular genres established in the written form in almost all Russia's national literatures are epic and fairytale. A fairytale is a universal genre where supra-national conventional feature prevail (see above); a multitude of the national fairytales translated into Russian account for the most comprehensive body of knowledge about the neighbouring cultures. This source of knowledge is rather archaic and mythological; it no doubt creates a far-fetched and non-realistic picture of the contemporary people which in no way facilitates a full-fledged cultural contact between nations, especially when we take into account incomplete and sketchy information about the present-day problems of the people.

Concerning epic, it likewise shows a lot of typologically similar features: existence of heroic and eschatological tales, poetic form, static imagery and others, but every people give its epic unique features which we shall discuss later.

However, in modern world literatures the genre spectrum consists of more than two or three elements. The literary exchange through translation can take place along the genre parameters and enrich both literatures, as it happened, for example, with Russian and German. Up to recently there was an exchange of novels,

stories, lyrical poetry, narrative poems, fantasy, belles-lettres genres, detective stories, children's literature, plays ... There was no parity only in one genre – non-fiction; there was little written in this genre in Russia, that is why Russian translations of German non-fiction far outnumbered its Russian counterparts in German translations. But what is the situation now? It looks like times have changed, or “translation enlightenment” did its work, but there has appeared a big number of quality non-fiction works in Russian (suffice it to mention *Dostay-uschee zveno* by S. Drobyshevsky in two volumes!).

Russian literature has no such exchange with any of Russia's ethnic literatures. It goes without saying that not every ethnic group in Russia enjoys a big variety of genres, yet several works of classical literature are translated in all languages of Russia (as a rule, the works of A. Pushkin, M. Gorky, L. Tolstoy). Such influences are subtle, and when we see familiar genres of a long story, a novel, a poem, essay, a lyrical poem in the national literature we cannot help noticing that these traditional forms have received different tonal characteristics in national literatures, which accounts for the ethnic colour in the genre interaction (we have studied the literary situation in Yakutia and Buryatia, and draw our conclusions from this research).

### Cultural uniqueness and its reflection in literature

Talking about the national colour we touch upon the issues of cultural uniqueness, originality, non-reduction to the typical, which can be manifested in the cultural realia, plot structure, conflict, but above all – in the emotional charge and interpretation of the character's actions.

The general opinion about the national cultural originality is rather ornamental, if we can put it so, which means it abounds in vivid material detail creating the exotic image of each culture. Best of all it is expressed in the folklore which is justly considered the most varied source of the cultural specificity. Thus, the authors of the monograph *Creating Children's Literature in the Evenk language* find in

Dolgan tales a wide range of cultural information: clothes, food and drink, household possessions, dwellings, plants, animals, etc. (Koptseva, 2017 II: 246-259). Cultural realia become the main source of cultural information.

Yet deeper cultural aspects cannot be described through this outward entourage. They are more likely to be connected with the specificity of the world outlook and the group historic experience. Thus, while analyzing Yakut literature we paid attention to the special self-perception of man in the competition with wild animals and unpredictable weather conditions; naturalism in describing hunting or details of everyday life in the face of wild nature. These dominants lend the narration on any topic the dramatic colouring.

On the other hand, Buryat literature looks light and life-assertive; even the most tragic collisions unfold against the background of sunlit nature – we observe this in poetry, prose or drama and children's literature. This emotional colouring is certainly linked with the Buddhist literary tradition, or the religious traditions of the Buryat culture, and can easily be traced in the contemporary Buryat Buddhist fables. (Mukhanov, 2011).

Literary traditions and the author's individual style have an influence on the cultural representation in the national literature. Stern naturalism and belief in man in F. Smetanin's *Hunter's Tales* go back to the traditions of the epic *Olonkho*; the choice of epithets in descriptions of nature in the works of modern Buryat poets have its roots in the style of Buddhist literature.

This is the reason why we cannot speak of either pure genre forms or pure national styles; however, we do not consider it interference or mixture – it is always a case of creative revision.

### **The catalogue of strategies in translating ethnic literatures into Russian**

In the time of the Soviet Union, since 1930s the main strategy of translating an ethnic literature into Russian was working with interlinear crib (for example, Pasternak's or Tikhonov's translations of Georgian poets (Zemskova,

2016), adaptations of folklore in the Leningrad branch of *Detgiz* editing office headed by S. Marshak. The efforts of the Soviet translators in translating from the ethnic languages of Russia into Russian are still waiting for proper evaluation, but working with interlinear cribs inevitably brought about literary adaptations, which led to losses and omissions (ideological editing of translated texts can be regarded as such, too).

The contemporary approach to translation from the ethnic languages of Russia is still being formed, but even at this stage we can point to its main distinctive feature – the translators of ethnic literatures are bilingual who command both native and Russian languages very well. This fact is a huge advantage, as linguacultural features of the original text can be accurately rendered in Russian – the knowledge of customs, ethnographic and religious or mystical realia help the translator to avoid unifying “abrasion” and keep the national colour. Nonetheless, the analysis of the present-day translations from the ethnic literatures into Russian revealed certain problems – deviations from the Russian literary norm typical for certain regions of Russia made their way into the translations, too. On the one hand, these deviations account for the specificity of Russian in the given region, on the other, they actively interfere with the understanding of the translated texts.

Throughout 2017-2018 the researches form the Strategic Centre of Translation Education in Russia (Russian Academy of Education) held a series of seminars in the universities of Yakutia and Buryatia. The seminars had its aim to revive the translation activity from the ethnic languages of Russia. In Yakutia we chose the works of Timofey Smetanin, a war veteran poet and writer. The genre spectrum was rather large: from war stories and poems to hunter's tales and children's literature. All the translations were done by professional translators – university trainers and students. In Buryatia we selected 12 contemporary authors; the genre and topical variety was wider, the translators were university trainers, students, volunteers, there were self-translations as well. The overall volume

of Yakutian texts was 250 pages, in Buryatia – about 300 pages.

The seminars mainly addressed two questions: the translation of realia which make up an important part of the national specifics of the text, and the issue of deviation from the literary norm of the target language in translations, in our case – Russian.

The texts of Timofey Smetanin, as well as the texts of contemporary Buryat authors, contain a large amount of cultural realia. They are geographic names (names of villages and towns), ethnographic (everyday life and culture), or religious and mystic phenomena, connected with the peoples' beliefs, and others.

The geographic realia (names of villages, regions, locations) are usually given in transcription, although one cannot always tell at once if the name refers to a locality or a business or an enterprise:

Бур. Батор Баторович, вы работали у нас в Улаан-Туя участковым инспектором, помните?

There are also attempts to introduce toponyms without transcription, which makes the meaning hard to grasp:

Бур. Ради этого я выехал спозаранку из районного центра, что в 20 километрах от моей родной деревни Шэнэнэтэ.

Ethnographic realia are actively used in Yakut and Buryat texts in the descriptions of everyday life, especially so in T. Smetanin's hunter's tales (for example, *чубуку* – bighorn sheep, *торбаса* – soft footwear made of deer leather, *пальма* – Syberian pole-arms). These realia require a special linguistic and cultural commentary, which was suggested the translators should do as a separate addendum to the book.

Religious and mystic realia are not very numerous in the text, yet they also invite a linguistic and cultural commentary:

1) Бур. Ай, бурхан! Я ведь не оказал почтения родному уголку, не угостил хозяев местности. Обязательно надо побрызгать сэржэм – от водки первинку (дээжэ), попросить прощения у Сахюсанов и Хозяев местности.

2) Бур. Холодом не повеяло, но чем-то спокойным или же мягким? Да, мягким,

*мягким повеяло... мягкое, мягкое – какое красивое слово. Почему этого слова не хватает в трудные времена? Мягкая душа, мягкое слово, сейчас говорят «мягкая пицца, мягкая постель», а как звучит «мягкое слово, мягкое образование».*

3) Як. Свои кости, окрепшие на берегах Лены, оставили они на Землях Европы.

4) Як. Я не видел якута, у которого от ужаса на поле битвы кости дрожали.

A Russian reader from other regions would hardly make the connection with the national religious rituals of the mentioned ritual of treating the masters of the land, or the words *т'уагкий* (soft) and *кости* (bones).

A similar commentary is needed for all sorts of exclamations, oaths, etc, which translators choose to keep in the translation:

1) Бур. Хамар – дабаан!!!! Горы под покровительством вечного синего неба.

2) Бур. Когда солнце нового дня уже светило ярко, взяв в обе руки дар духов тайги – большого сильного соболя – произнеся: Аа-хуры-й, аа-хр-ы-ы! Прибыла добыча!

3) Як. «Дети мои, потомки мои, Вы отправляетесь в великий путь, Не черните имя своей Лены-реки, Не рухните от вооруженного ружьем, Не упадите от вооруженного луком, Уруй-Айхал!»

Likewise, interjections in transcription (without giving Russian counterparts) require commentary:

1) Як. Начинаю крякать, подобно уткам “маат-маат”, “мээт-мээт”.

2) Як. Вдруг слышу шум “сарк” – это, ведь, утка села близко.

3) Бур. – О-ё-ёо! Ха-ха-ха! Страшно прозвучал приговор?

4) Бур. Ой-е да-а.

Realia also embrace folk sayings and proverbs, idiomatic phrases, and the necessity to provide a linguistic and cultural commentary is obvious:

1) Бур. В конце концов с их «надежного рта дошло до собачьих ушей», т.е. все, кому не лень, узнали

2) Бур. Возможно, согласно поговорке «у огня не бывает пролады, у гнева – рассудка»

3) Бур. Но начальник, пытавшийся заставить Цынгунова «лизать себе подошву», нашёл метод, который очень хорошо укоротил бы его нрав.

Another important question is deviation from the literary norm which is brought about by the violation of the normative collocation patterns or inaccuracy in the choice of lexical variants.

Thus, the following examples illustrate mistakes in the choice of lexical or grammatical equivalents:

#### **Contamination of idiomatic phrases**

- 1) Як. Голыми руками его не победишь.
- 2) Бур. Однако неожиданно-негаданно, ты сидишь, поешь, сразу не думала, даже в ум не брала.
- 3) Бур. Да, судьба как одарит некоторых, так одарит всем лучшим по высшей мере.

#### **Inaccuracy in the choice of lexical variant**

- 1) Бур. а сам присел на имитированную табуретку.
- 2) Бур. Кроме костра, который издавал щелчки.
- 3) Як. Решил немного вздремнуть и поутру пойти смотреть (осмотреть) окрестности.
- 4) Як. Смотря в щель входа, я уже смирился с тем, что встречу смерть здесь.
- 5) Як. Вот он сильно подпрыгнул, и я слетел с седла, упал торчком в грязь.
- 6) Як. Я забился в страхе за свою жизнь, но выбраться не смог, меня будто затягивало в эту липкую жижу.

#### **Choice of verbs**

- 1) Як. Огромные торбаса вылетели из ее ног.
- 2) Як. Все подо мной промокло – и локоть, и коленки: одежда впиталась холодной водой.
- 3) Як. Я подошел посмотрел: в ухе медведя было очень много муравьев, выходили-заходили.

4) Як. Ему только-только начался грезиться чудесный сон

#### **Choice of aspect – perfect / non-perfect verb**

- 1) Як. Сестренка крикнула: – Аа-аа-аа! Я не останусь, возьми меня с собой.
- 2) Як. Муравей медведя побеждал.
- 3) Як. И вдруг с высокой горы, и без того пугающей видом нас, что-то с грохотом падало.
- 4) Як. мы как-то наловчились поймать уток без промаха.
- 5) Як. При ударе с высоты со взмахом шест издавал свистящий звук, к тому времени утка успевала уклоняться и быстро ускользала.

#### **Verbs of action or body parts**

Як. Вдруг почувствовал в руке ожог, успел крикнуть «больно» оказалось, что я сижусь, запихнув руку себе в рот.

#### **Collocations**

- 1) Як. Хотел было голову почесать, да среди своих лохматых волос вдруг обнаружил яйцо!
- 2) Як. и стала горько реветь.
- 3) Як. Сутулясь низко, осторожно подкрался.
- 4) Бур. И он с осторожностью спросил у неё: «Почём цена?».

On the syntactical level there are deviations in verbal government or agreement, colloquial syntax, which can be illustrated by the following:

#### **Government**

- 1) Як. Прицелился, но лось был от меня в большом расстоянии.
- 2) Як. Испугавшись от моего шума, утки разлетелись в разные стороны.
- 3) Як. А сейчас идем в поле боя.
- 4) Бур. Я, что, должна была преградить путь собой перед двумя мужчинами?

#### **Agreement in gender**

- 1) Як. В то утро я встал рано, поел наскоро, взял в дорогу лосятины, вяленого мяса, верного друга – ружье и пошел по излучинам речки.

2) Як. и ружье зацепившись об тальник выстрелил.

3) Як. Друг взял мою утку и держал его за клюв и хвост, словно он еще живой.

4) Як. Чье ружье, которое раньше служил, рано взрывает.

5) Бур. Однако не стоять мне на ногах, если я сама не была б такой жилистой и проворной, – услышав такое, разочарованный саранча пошел восвояси, не став даже с ней разговаривать.

#### **Agreement in number**

Як. Поздней осенью я с другом вышли охотиться на лося в речку Силяннях.

#### **Word order**

1) Як. “Ну-ка, оттолкнись от камня!” – крикнул мне он. Я стал изо всех сил отталкиваться.

2) Як. Так я его повел на поводке.

3) Як. Если бы я поймал этого селезня, стало бы их три.

#### **Omission of subject**

1) Як. Увлечись охотой, забыл, что ставил затвор ружья, когда целился на лося.

2) Як. Два передних копыта лося были в одной стороне ямы, а задние копыта в другой стороне. Я оказался между ними. Чуть ли не затоптал печень.

3) Як. А вид с того места на гору был устрашающий – стояли наклоном, будто вот-вот падают на нас.

4) Як. Постепенно стало шумно, вокруг кряканье усилилось. То садились, то летали.

The biggest number of deviations from the norm is caused by register disruptions, especially when a high-flown word is placed next to a vulgarism, which immediately created a comic effect, but also by repetitions, the use of vulgar colloquialisms or diminutives.:

#### **Register disruption, unnecessary amelioration or pejoration of style**

1) Бур. – Вытащите! Спасите! – стала она орать, что есть мочи.

– Смогу ли я такой, с набитым животом, справиться с этой миссией?

2) Бур. В 17 лет, как и все мои сверстники частенько игнорировал тёплую одежду.

#### **Elevation of style**

1) Як. Но это меня сильно не волновало, я дивился обилию птиц на озере и предвкушал богатую добычу.

2) Як. Тщетные усилия вконец вымотали меня.

3) Як. Начинаю крякать, подобно уткам.

4) Як. Нет. Все прошло, – промолвил он и пошел вперед, показывая, что боль прошла. Но он все еще хромал.

5) Як. Я кладу в рот кусочек вкусного хлеба, я знаю, что это плод твоего неустанного труда.

6) Бур. Сегодня же, воочию узрев их снова, нутром их почувствовал.

7) Бур. Твоё появление в родной деревне – радостное событие, благая весть на фоне размеренной тишины сельской жизни.

8) Бур. Но эта охота, которую он долго ждал, предзнаменовалась одним событием.

#### **Use of obsolete words**

1) Бур. Давеча, увидев Ивана Филипповича, поняв, что лишился ордера, он сразу не огорчился.

2) Бур. Спетая тобой давеча песня так тронула моё сердце и ещё появилось странное ощущение, как будто какой-то комок застрял у меня в горле.

#### **Bureaucratic clichés**

1) Як. Пришлось мне спастись от волка бегством

2) Бур. Пусть такие встречи состоятся завтра, а сегодня я должен осуществить свою давнюю мечту.

3) Бур. Зелень важно своевременно успеть собрать.

4) Бур. В ответ на поступившую просьбу Джордж вытягивает руку.

#### **Colloquialisms**

1) Як. Оставил на этой ветке один сучок, заточил его ножиком, и приделал «ошейник»

*так, чтобы острый сучок впивался волку в загривок, если он дернется.*

2) Бур. *Но отмечая радость встреч с дорогими сердцу людьми, главное – не переборщить со спиртными напитками, ведь никто насильно не льёт тебе в глотку.*

3) Бур. *Ведь, кроме, как кушать, я ничего не умею, такой вот я несуразный, – лениво ответил саранча.*

4) Бур. *Чтобы выпендриться или с другой какой-то целью?*

5) Бур. *Достать его зимой в Ангарске нереально.*

6) Бур. *Достав из сумки харчишки и бутылку.*

### **Repetitions**

1) Як. *А дождь с грозой словно гнался за мной и, догнав, стал лить как из ведра. На улице стемнело. Я перекинул ружье стволом вниз и спешно, переходя то на шаг, то на бег, направился к шалашу. Стало темно, хоть глаз выколи.*

2) Як. *С каждой охотой азарт становится сильнее, поэтому я этим не насытился, захотел еще больше.*

3) Як. *Тщетные усилия вконец вымотали меня и на меня навалилась дремота...*

4) Як. *На третий день обошли много лесных чащоб, но до полудня так и ничего не увидели. Мой друг пошел в шалаш готовить чай, тем временем я решил обойти одну лесную чащу.*

5) Бур. *Джордж вытягивает руку с наручными часами и с щеголеватым видом подносит их к глазам, скрывающимся за черными круглыми очками, напоминающими лягушачьи глаза.*

In our analysis of rough translations we came across the cases of poor knowledge of Russian, or wrong ideas of the lexical meaning of words, which may create a comic effect. So it happened with a fashionable youth word *улет*, which in the quoted example means only a seasonal migration of birds:

Як. *Издавала слышно, как кормятся утки перед осенним улетом, бойко плескаясь (плещась) и громко крякая в мелководье.*

So, the adequate rendering of cultural realia and adherence to the Russian literary norm, chiefly the uniformity of style, comes to the fore in the present-day translations of Russia's ethnic literatures. In translations of cultural realia translators mainly resort to transcription / transliteration, transcription of exclamations and interjections, in-built textual commentaries of idiomatic units and proverbs. Yet most often a linguistic cultural commentary is needed as an addendum to translation.

### **Conclusions**

Polycultural character of the translated literature now supersedes its mythological monoculturalism seen as an idealized (and ideologically charged) ambition, or a naïve attempt at equivalence or, if you please, a dream. Yes, we always dreamed that upon entering the noble circle of great Russian literature translated literature would acquire some classical features. In this respect translated ethnic literatures of Russia (and the USSR) underwent bigger adaptations and corrections than translated literary works of European authors – although this question is still pending research.

The two-step processing of the text (1 step – interlinear translator, 2 step – adapting translator), never fully represented the original text, but instead polished it levelling the texts belonging to different nations to the common denominator of “the Soviet people's creative work” and made possible the ideological treatment of it. It came to be substituted by a single-step interactive model employed in the cases when a translator has a native-speaker mastery of both languages, and, more importantly, exists in both cultures simultaneously. This situation, in our view, is possible only in the regions where two (or more) cultures have been actively practiced for a long time.

The interactive model implies a discussion of every text at bilingual seminars and webinars with at least two active parties: regional authors are involved as tutors, and specialists-supervisors act as guiding coordinators of the process. Russian becomes the main language of communication; a big part of editing is discussed via skype or electronic communication. Two manuscripts are prepared for the bilingual pub-

lication: the original text and the translation. A detailed cultural and historical commentary as a separate chapter of the book will provide cognitive support necessary for the polycultural text. Our experience has proved the need for illustrations for every cultural realia, as the cultural specificity of the original text calls for the visual support of the verbal translation.

The interactive character of this model will help to overcome the minor imperfections in the Russian translations which can be

chalked down to the flexibility of the norm in all modern languages rather than to the translators' remoteness from the exemplary models of the Russian language. In fact, mass media and the network culture bring users of language close to the literary norm so they do not feel at the world's end in terms of language use. On the other hand, the democratization of the language use and a wide spread of gadgets make possible almost instantaneous replication of linguistic changes and innovations.

## References

Avtonomova, N. (2016). *Poznaniye i perevod. Opyty filosofii yazyka* [Cognition and translation. Philosophy of language essays]. 2-e izd. ispr. i dop. Moscow-Saint Petersburg: Tsentr gumanitar. initsiativ (ser. Humanitas), 736 p.

Avtonomova, N. (2015). TOPOS PYATYY: «Byuro nakhodok perevoda: Ponyatiya istorii, kultury i identichnosti v issledovaniyakh sovremennoy Rossii» [TOPOS FIVE: “The Bureau of the Foundations of Translation: The Concepts of History, Culture and Identity in the Studies of Modern Russia”]. In *Toposy filosofii Natalii Avtonomovoy. K yubileyu* [Philosophy toposes of Natalia Avtonomova. For the anniversary], otv. red.-sost.: B. Pruzhinin. T. Shchedrina. Moscow, 529–543.

Alpatov, V. (2014). Yazykovaya politika v Rossii i mire [Language policy in Russia and the world]. In *Yazykovaya politika i yazykovyye konflikty v sovremennom mire* [Language policy and language conflicts in the modern world], Moscow, 11–24.

*Federalnyy zakon ot 30 aprelya 1999 g. № 82-FZ «O garantiyakh prav korennykh malochislennykh narodov Rossiyskoy Federatsii» (s izmeneniyami i dopolneniyami)* [Federal Law of April 30, 1999 No. 82-FZ “On Guarantees of the Rights of the Indigenous Minorities of the Russian Federation” (as amended)]. Access mode: [http://constitution.garant.ru/act/right/180406/#block\\_1](http://constitution.garant.ru/act/right/180406/#block_1)

Galayeva, Z. (2016). Etnicheskiye traditsii, kultura korennykh narodov Kavkaza i problemy ikh sokhraneniya [Ethnic traditions, culture of the indigenous peoples of the Caucasus and the problems of their preservation]. In *Mir nauki. Sotsiologiya, filosofiya, kulturologiya* [World of Science. Sociology, philosophy, cultural studies], Vypusk 2. Available at: <https://sfk-mn.ru/PDF/07SFK216.pdf>

«Gordyy mysh» (2007). Osetinskaya skazka v animatsii N. Berezovoy [“Proud Mouse”. Ossetian Tale Animated by N. Berezovoy], studiya «Pilot» [Pilot Studio]. In *Internet-proyekt «Gora samotsvetov»* [Internet project “Mountain of gems”], Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TA6od-AjfrU>

Ivshin, L. (2010). *Stanovleniye i razvitiye udmurtskoy grafiki i orfografii v XVIII – pervoy polovine XIX veka* [The formation and development of Udmurt graphics and spelling in the XVIII – first half of the XIX century]. Ekaterinburg – Izhevsk: UrO RAN, 236 p.

Kirko, V. (2015). Postsovetskiye praktiki sokhraneniya etnokulturnoy identichnosti korennykh narodov Severa i Sibiri v Krasnoyarskom kraye Rossiyskoy Federatsii [Post-Soviet practices of preserving the ethnocultural identity of the indigenous peoples of the North and Siberia in the Krasnoyarsk Territory of the Russian Federation]. In *Sotsiodinamika* [Sociodynamics], 6, 113–133.

Koptseva, N. (2017). Sozdaniye proizvedeniy detskoy literatury na evenkiyskom yazyke: Monografiya [Creation of children's literature in Evenk language: Monograph]. In *Natalia Petrovna Koptseva and etc.*, Izdatelskiye resheniya [Publishing solutions], 380 p.

Koptseva, N., Bakhova, N., Medyantseva, N. (2011). Klassicheskiye i sovremennyye podkhody k etnokulturnym issledovaniyam. Yadro etnosa [Classic and modern approaches to ethnocultural research. The core of the ethnic group]. In *Zhurnal Sibirskogo federalnogo universiteta. Gumanitarnyye nauki* [Journal of the Siberian Federal University. Humanities], 4(5), 615–632.

Kukhareva, E. (2016). Rol perevoda v formirovaniy arabo-musul'manskoj i sovremennoj arabskoj kul'tury [The role of translation in the formation of Arab-Muslim and modern Arab culture]. In *Perevod v prostranstve i vremeni. Materialy mezhdunarodnoj konferentsii RGGU [Translation in space and time. Materials of the International Conference of the RSUH]*, Moscow, June 30 – July 2 2016, Moscow: R. Valent, 100–111.

Limerov, P., Sozina E. (2014). «Biarmiya» Kallistrata Zhakova kak rekonstruktsiya severnogo eposa [“Biarmia” Kallistrata Zhakova as a reconstruction of the northern epic]. In *Uralskiy istoricheskiy vestnik [The Urals Historical Bulletin]*, Izd-vo Instituta istorii i arkheologii URO RAN [Publishing House of the Institute of History and Archeology, UB RAS], Ekaterinburg, 3 (44), 6–15.

Material'naya i dukhov'naya kul'tura narodov Yakutii v muzeyakh mira (XVII – nachalo XX vv.) [Material and spiritual culture of the people of Yakutia in world museums (17<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries)] (2017). In *Postoyan. Forum OON po voprosam koren. Narodov [UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues]*, Yakutsk: Bichik, 784 p.

Mikhaylova, I. (2007). *Yazyk niderlandskoj poezii i problemy poeticheskogo perevoda. Monografiya [The language of Dutch poetry and the problems of poetic translation. Monograph]*. Saint Petersburg: Izd-vo SPbGU [SPbSU Publishing House].

Mukhanov, I. (2011). *Dozhd iz tsvetov. Buryatskiye buddiyskiye pritchi [Rain of flowers. Buryat Buddhist parables]*.

Nesmelaya, A. (2012). Etnicheskiye traditsii. kul'tura malochislennykh korennykh narodov Severa i problemy ikh sokhraneniya [Ethnic traditions, culture of small indigenous peoples of the North and the problems of their preservation]. In *Vestnik TGU. Gumanitarnyye nauki. Pedagogika i psikhologiya [TSU Journal. Humanities. Pedagogy and psychology]*, 12 (116), 169–172.

*Olonkho: Nurgun Botur the Swift. By Platon A. Oyunsky* (2014). RENESSANCE BOOKS PO Box 219 Folkestone Kent CT20 2WP UK.

Orlova, E. (2016). Muzeynaya pedagogika kak sposob sokhraneniya i populyarizatsii kul'turnogo naslediya korennykh malochislennykh narodov Kuzbassa [Museum pedagogy as a way of preserving and promoting the cultural heritage of indigenous peoples of Kuzbass]. In *Uchenyye zapiski muzeya-zapovednika “Tomskaya pisanitsa” [Scientific Notes of the Museum-Reserve “Tomsk Pisanitsa”]*, 3, 3(3), 10-15.

Ostapova, E. (2017). «BIARMIYA» K. F. Zhakova v perevode na komi yazyk: obraz Vermorta [«BIHARMIA» of KF Jakov in translation to komi language: the image of Vermort]. In *Finno-Ugorskiy mir [Finno-Ugric World]*, 1, 59–63.

Petrov, A. (2011). Problemy sokhraneniya i razvitiya yazykov i literatur malochislennykh narodov Severa [Problems of preservation and development of languages and literatures of small peoples of the North]. In *Universum: Vestnik Gertsenovskogo universiteta [Universum: Bulletin of Herzen University]*, 11, 37–40.

*Pismennyye yazyki mira: Yazyki Rossiyskoy Federatsii [Written languages of the world: Languages of the Russian Federation]* (2000, 2003). Moscow: Academia.

Razumovskaya, V. (2014). Translating Aboriginal Siberian and Circumpolar Cultures in Russia. In *Translators. Interpreters. and Cultural Negotiators Mediating and Communicating Power from the Middle Ages to the Modern Era*, F.M. Federici & D. Tessicini (Eds.), London: P ALGRAVE MACMILLAM, 190–212.

Razumovskaya, V. (2015). Siberia in the Mirror of Other Cultures: Literature and Translation. In *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences*, 12 (2015 8), 2939–2946.

Razumovskaya, V. (2016). Perevodimost kul'turnoy informatsii i strategii khudozhestvennogo perevoda [Translatability of cultural information and strategy of literary translation]. In *Vestnik SPbGU. Seriya 9. Filologiya. Vostokovedeniye. Zhurnalistika [Vestnik of Saint Petersburg State University. Series 9. Philology. Orientalism. Journalism]*, 4, 110–121. DOI: 10.21638/11701/spbu09.2016.409.

Schleiermacher, F.D.E. (1813). Ueber die verschiedenen Methoden des Uebersetzens. In *Das Problem des Uebersetzens*. Hg. von Hans Joachim Stuerig. Stuttgart 1963.

Silant'yeva, N., Sun'tsov, A. (2016). Praktika realizatsii konstitutsionnogo prava korennyimi malochislennymi narodami na sokhraneniye rodnogo yazyka (na primere Khanty-Mansiyskogo avtonomnogo okru-

ga – Yugry) [The practice of the implementation of constitutional law by indigenous peoples to preserve their native language (on the example of the Khanty-Mansiysk Autonomous Okrug – Ugra)]. In *Evraziyskiy yuridicheskiy zhurnal* [*Eurasian law journal*], (2), 189–191.

*Strategiya gosudarstvennoy natsionalnoy politiki Rossiyskoy Federatsii na period do 2025 goda* [*Strategy of the state national policy of the Russian Federation for the period up to 2025*], Available at: [http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons\\_doc\\_LAW\\_139350/ff30f91360f2917b325d507685fd90353895d2bd](http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_139350/ff30f91360f2917b325d507685fd90353895d2bd).

Strizhevskaya, V. (2013). Narody Severa Sibiri v globalnykh migratsionnykh protsessakh: problemy vyzhivaniya i perspektivy sokhraneniya kultury v otsenkakh zapadnykh issledovateley [The peoples of the North of Siberia in global migration processes: problems of survival and prospects for preserving culture in the estimates of Western researchers]. In *Sovremennyye problemy nauki i obrazovaniya* [*Modern problems of science and education*], 6, 1000 p.

Tereshchenko, N. (1954). *Nenetskiye skazki. Obrabotka Z.M. Zadunayskoy* [*Nenets tales. Z. Zadunayskaya's adaptation*], Moscow-Leningrad.

Troyak, I. (2014). Vypusk detskoy literatury dlya korennykh malochislennykh narodov Dalnego Vostoka v kontse XX – nachale XXI v. [Publication of children's literature for the indigenous peoples of the Far East at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> centuries]. In *Trudy GPNTB SO RAN* [*Proceedings of SPSTL SB RAS*], 6, 191–201.

Usacheva, Y. (2016). Sovremennaya shotlandskaya literatura i multikulturalizm i ikh svyaz s ponyatiyami «perevod» i «mirovaya literatura [Modern Scottish literature and multiculturalism and their connection with the concepts of “translation” and “world literature”]. In *Perevod v prostranstve i vremeni. Materialy mezhdunarodnoy konferentsii RGGU. Moskva. 30 iyunya – 2 iyulya 2016* [*Translation in space and time. Materials of the International Conference of the RSUH, Moscow, June 30 - July 2 2016*], 254–263.

Venuti, L. (2008). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Abingdon, Oxon, U.K.: Routledge.

*Yakutiya. Istoriko-kulturnyy atlas. Priroda. Istoriya. Etnografiya. Sovremennost* [*Yakutia. Historical and cultural atlas. Nature. Story. Ethnography. Modernity*] (2007). Moscow: Feoriya.

Zhakov, K. (1993). *Biarmiya, Syktyvkar*: Komi knizhnoye izdatelstvo [Komi book publishing house].

Zhakov, K. (1990). *Pod shum severnogo vetra* [*Under the noise of the north wind*], Syktyvkar: Komi knizhnoye izdatelstvo [Komi book publishing house].

Zamyatin, K., Pasanen, A., Saarikivi, Y. (2012). *Kak i zachem sokhranyat yazyki narodov Rossii* [*How and why to preserve the languages of the peoples of Russia*], Khelsinki, 180 p.

Zemskova, E. (2016). Perevodchiki s yazykov natsionalnykh respublik v sovetskoj literaturnoy kritike serediny 1930-kh godov [Translators of the languages of the national republics in the Soviet literary criticism of the mid-1930s]. In *Novyy filologicheskiy vestnik* [*The Neu Philological Bulletin*], 4 (39), 167-177.

## Поликультурность переводной русской литературы: якутский и бурятский опыт

**И.С. Алексеева<sup>а</sup>, А.В. Бояркина<sup>б</sup>**

*<sup>а</sup>Российский государственный педагогический  
университет им. А.И. Герцена*

*Российская Федерация, Санкт-Петербург*

*<sup>б</sup>Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет  
Российская Федерация, Санкт-Петербург*

---

**Аннотация.** В статье рассматривается феномен поликультурности современных переводов произведений народов России на русский язык, а путь к достижению этого качества – как новая интерактивная модель, сменяющая собой двухступенчатый метод перевода XX века. Авторы отталкиваются от ретроспективы традиций обработки текстов народов России и противопоставляют ему новые экспериментальные данные переводов якутской и бурятской литературы на русский язык.

**Ключевые слова:** интерактивная поликультурная модель, русский язык как культурный посредник, языки народов России, жанры национальных литератур, стратегии перевода, литературная норма русского языка, иллюстрированный комментарий.

Научная специальность: 10.00.00 – филологические науки.