University of Alberta

Rediscovering *The Master and Margarita*: from Creation to Adaptation

by

Olga Leshcheva

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Slavic Languages & Literatures

Department of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies

Spring 2013
Edmonton, Alberta

Abstract

This work discusses the complexity of Mikhail Bulgakov's novel *The Master and Margarita*. It investigates the challenges encountered when translating the novel into a different language as well as into a different medium. The first part of the thesis briefly examines the history of creation of the novel, as well as an overview of the most popular translations. Through comparative analysis of the original text with its English variants the thesis then demonstrates how Bulgakov's messages were communicated. The methodological framework is based on the works by Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet, Eugene Nida, Antoine Berman and others. Through close reading and its comparison to cinematic adaptation, the thesis analyzes how Bulgakov's messages were rendered into a different medium. Theoretical works by Patrice Pavis, Linda Hutcheon, Robert Stam and others serve as a foundation for this analysis and reveal the changes in approach towards adaptation.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my thankfulness to my supervisors Dr. Peter Rolland and Dr. Elena Siemens and who have helped me develop my potential and provided knowledge, inspiration and encouragement.

I would like to acknowledge Dr. Siemens' guidance, support, and positive outlook. It made work much more interesting and rewarding. Thank you for your always constructive criticism, it helped me grow as a scholar.

I would like to express my special gratitude to Dr. Rolland. Thank you for your patience, your support and guidance. Thank you for your always welcome advice and your constant support. Thank you for inspiring discussions and always useful recommendations. Without you it would not have been possible to accomplish what I have so far.

I owe my sincere gratitude to Dr. Anne Malena who ignited my interest in translation and through translation courses provided me with the necessary tools for my discoveries. Thank you very much for your professional help and advice. Thank you for making the discovery process so exciting.

I also owe a huge debt of gratitude to my parents, Aleksey and Lidiya Leshchev, as well as my sister Nadezhda Leshcheva, for their constant support. Thank you for helping me stay sane and positive. Thank you for your love, understanding, and unending patience. Words cannot express how much I appreciate you in my life.

Table of Contents

Introduction

This is a beautiful book; it makes one proud of Russian literature and makes one desire to introduce it to other countries and cultures. *The Master and Margarita* is one of my favorite books. I have had the joy of reading it in my native Russian many a time.

The novel, *The Master and Margarita,* by Mikhail Bulgakov is considered one of the greatest novels of the 20th century. Written during the Stalinist purges in the 1930s, it expresses the criticism of dictatorship, bureaucracy, and corruption in society under Stalin through an allegory of good and evil, raising questions about human nature, atheism, and totalitarianism.

Russian readers cannot praise the novel enough, as they understand the allegories and the allusions interwoven in sophisticated verbal fabric. *The Master and Margarita* deserves special attention, as even experts and experienced or well-informed readers see it "as perplexing as it is entertaining, offering so many clues to understanding, that it inevitably thwarts any initial attempt to unravel its meaning" (Barratt 1). Bulgakov's inability to publish or emigrate influenced both the novel's satire and, what is more important, its language – full of allusions and wordplay. The first publication of the novel (1967) was censored. The translations followed immediately.

Considering its significance as a work of world literature, I was curious to see how well the novel's messages were communicated into English and how, if at all, it could be a source of inspiration to a foreign reader. Therefore, I was

determined to see different translations and form my own admittedly subjective point of view.

The complexity of translating the novel and the number of existing and newly emerging translations is interconnected with the complicated destiny of both the author of the novel and his brainchild - *The Master and Margarita*.

On the following pages I will focus on both inter-lingual and inter-semiotic translations of the novel. I have divided my work into 3 parts. Each chapter relates to a particular topic in the discussion of *The Master and Margarita*, its history, and its translation.

In Chapter One I study the novel's history, which will unravel some of the intricacies and mysteries of its creation, thereby leading to a possible explanation as to why there are so many translations available and why even more are appearing. According to Pym, translation history is "an activity addressing questions of concern to the present" (Pym 123). A look into the complex history of the manuscript and the adverse circumstances surrounding the creation of the novel will help clear up some of the confusion around perceptions caused by different translations. As any translation is an example of the intercultural process, reviewing the history of translation of this particular novel "might help affirm [our] intercultural specificity" (Pym 17).

In Chapter Two I set out to critically analyze the translations of the novel *The Master and Margarita*, as well as the number of translation theories employed in the process of translation and in my critical analysis. In order to do so, I will first, at some length, consider theoretical work that dominated in the

time period the translations were done, and which, therefore, may have informed the translation practice. Then I will also analyze how and to what effect the theoretical frameworks were employed in the translation. Finally, I will try to give my critical view on how the use of a particular theoretical framework might have helped me analyze any individual translation.

In Chapter Three, I will concentrate on the translation of the novel into a cinematic adaptation. I will analyze how the change of the medium – from text to TV mini series, brings about change. I will also focus on different factors that are important to take into account when analyzing the implications and peculiarities of a particular translation. I will generally discuss the views of the director and the political atmosphere at the time of Putin's accession to power in 2000 and the years after. I will comment on different types of adaptations used in *The Master and Margarita* TV series. I will concentrate on the "ideotextual" dimension of the adaptation, and how it was capable of changing the meaning initially intended by Bulgakov.

My research will therefore emphasize the importance of the translation and the figure of translator (or adaptor) in communicating or distorting the important messages of the author.

My research can come particularly useful for the future generation of translators, the ones that will hopefully have a broader view on translation, sharing the following opinion: "What is needed in place of such a monumental history is the idea of a history of singularity and particularity, a history that defies respectability or generalization and that welcomes the surprise of the future as it

makes clear the specificities and particularities, the events, of history" (Grosz qtd. in Malena 87).

Chapter I: History of Creation

Mikhail Bulgakov died in 1940 at age 49. He started working on his novel in 1928. In 1929 he gave the novel's first chapter to the magazine *Nedra* to be published, but it was rejected (Barratt 11).

Literature in the Soviet Union at the time was supposed to serve the purpose of promoting political goals in the atmosphere of overall fear. As Solzhenitzyn said, "Any adult inhabitant of this country, from a collective farmer up to a member of the Politburo, always knew that it would take only one careless word or gesture and he would fly off irrevocably into the abyss" (qtd. in Jones 198). The regime of dictatorship in the late 1920s-early 1930s turned into the one of terror (1937), striking hardest on the intelligentsia, oppressed in society, who had traditionally expressed the ideas of resistance to the Tsarist regime and certain elements of Bolshevik rule. According to Conquest, the Communists took seriously the principle of right and wrong ideas; "wrong" ideas had to be crushed (Conquest 431). The heaviest toll of the Terror was among writers. Conquest gives an astonishing figure: of the 700 writers who met at the First Writers' Congress in 1934, only 50 survived to see the second in 1954. Another historian, Roy Medvedev, in his book *O Staline i Stalinizme* (English: *On Stalin and Stalinism*) says that from "the cultural world more than a thousand perished" (115). Writers and artists were in the widest category of those denounced as "socially dangerous" in the sense of "undermining discretionarily defined social values" (Smith and Oleszczuk 6). They were often diagnosed with schizophrenia and sent to psychiatric hospitals.

After the 1932 reorganization of writers and artists into unions under state control, those who wanted to work in a literary field became, in Stalin's words, "engineers of the soul" (Suny 213) and perforce supported (at least externally) the regime and educated the population in the "narrowing ideology of the victorious Stalinists" (Suny 269). Many outstanding writers, poets, and film and stage directors of the time (friends of Bulgakov) were censored, banned, prosecuted, executed, or imprisoned in the late 30s. However, the stifling atmosphere was there long before. Unable to publish or emigrate and with most of his theatrical plays banned, Bulgakov came under serious psychological pressure. In a state of 'literary schizophrenia', he burned his greatest novel *The Master and Margarita* (Barratt 39). Presumably spied on, certainly interrogated, and ordered to burn the manuscript, Bulgakov is said to have divided the novel in two parts, burning one and hiding the other. Later on he restored the burnt part from memory.

With Stalin's permission, Bulgakov was hired by the Moscow Art Theatre as an assistant director and literary consultant. However, his plays generally were not staged during the 1930s and were quickly withdrawn if and when staged. Though discouraged and unable to publish his works, Bulgakov renewed his work on *The Master and Margarita* in 1934 as a challenge to the rule of dictatorship.

A look into Bulgakov's biography and the wider historical context of the time helps to reveal the impossibility of Bulgakov's publishing the novel. It also helps to restore a wider picture of the creation of the novel: its burning and restoration, and even more importantly, the assistance of Bulgakov's wife, who was left in charge of the novel.

The first draft is believed to have been completed in 1936, and the third draft by 1937 (Belobrovtseva and Kuljus 28). Up until his death Bulgakov worked on his masterpiece, assisted by his wife. In 1940, before his death, he told his wife to hide the manuscript in fear of authorities finding and destroying it. It is believed that Bulgakov "almost" finished his novel, as "[s]ome loose ends or antagonisms in the storyboard show that the author died a little too early" (*Master & Margarita*). Joan Dalaney states that "Konstantin Simonov, head of the Commission on the Literary Legacy of Mikhail Bulgakov, wrote that "Bulgakov had actually finished the book, but had returned to it again and again to add and revise" (Dalaney 89). The manuscript was preserved by Bulgakov's wife, Elena Sergeyevna. Wanting to ease Bulgakov's pain, she promised her husband that his novel would, by all means, be published. She kept her promise, proving the now famous words from *The Master and Margarita*: "Manuscripts don't burn." (Bulgakov, 287) .

Fully aware of the necessity to work with reliable sources, I realized that the archives should become a logical and necessary step in my research process. However, with Bulgakov's archives located in Moscow, Russia, I had no access to his manuscripts. This proved an obstacle, so I have referred to different critics in the hopes of finding those commenting on the archival data. After filtering through critics' focusing on the literary complexities of the novel, I narrowed down my research to a closer look of the critical works of Barratt, Chudakova and that of Belobrovtseva and Kuljus. Surprisingly, Barratt and Belobrovtseva and

Kuljus, coming from different time periods and different scholarly traditions, hold a very similar point of view on Bulgakov's manuscripts.

My choice can be easily justified. Andrew Barratt comes from the Western tradition and presents the view from the 1980s. Belobrovtseva and Kuljus are Russian scholars, presenting a different school of thought and a more contemporary view (published in 2007). Chudakova is an expert on Bulgakov, a well-respected scholar in the field of Soviet Literature and the chairman of the Bulgakov Foundation.

Publications in Russian

As it turns out, there are at least three different Russian versions of the text.

After Bulgakov's death in 1940, the novel was not published for another 26 years. *The Master and Margarita* saw its first publication in the journal "Moskva" in 1966-1967, which became a major event in Soviet society, and within hours of its appearance, all the copies of the journal were sold out. The novel was one of the most "sought-after literary items in the Soviet Union" and stimulated the true rediscovery of the writer (Barratt 11).

Bulgakov's rehabilitation became possible only in the late 50s-early 60s. However, with Brezhnev in power (1963) , cultural freedom was curtailed and a return of Stalinist repressions followed. The trials of the writers in 1966 as well as the hounding of Solzhenitsyn, all show that times had changed and can serve as an explanation to the first official, heavily censored publication of the novel, in

which twelve percent of the text was either removed or changed. Most of the changes or omissions were most likely politically motivated.

The censored portions immediately appeared in *Samizdat*: "literature secretly written, copied, and circulated in the former Soviet Union and usually critical of practices of the Soviet government" ("Samizdat"). They were published by Scherz Verlag in Switzerland in 1967 and included later in the Possev Verlag edition (Frankfurt-am-Main, 1969) and the YMCA-Press edition (Paris 1969) (Barratt 7).

For Soviet readers the restored text was available only in 1973, prepared by Anna Saakyants and published by "Khudozhestvennaya Literatura" (Belobrovtseva and Kuljus 31). However, that publication was not in accordance with Bulgakov's will or additions made by his widow, who officially represented the will of the author. According to Belobrovtseva and Kuljus, this published version had more than 3,000 discrepancies in comparison with Bulgakov's wife's text. Only Bulgakova had access to the latest changes Bulgakov made to the novel before his death, and only she could add them to the novel, having a legal right to do so. Most likely, the editor of the 1973 version did not have one of the notebooks with revisions at her disposal when the novel came to print. The 1989 publication gave birth to another version of the novel that combined Bulgakova's version with the 1973 version and left many questions unanswered. As Barratt correctly notices, the main difficulty of the work is "the absence of a truly authoritative canonical text" (7).

The list of holdings of *The Master and Margarita* in Bulgakov's archive, the only source to his unpublished materials in the process of writing the novel, supports the complexity of the work:

> Twenty notebooks containing successive handwritten redactions, two notebooks of [background] materials, three typed texts of the novel (two of which reflect three stages of work on them), and a notebook with new redactions of individual pages and with additions to the text taken down by Ye. S. Bulgakova from the sick writer's dictation in 1939 and 1940. (qtd. in Barratt 40-41)

The division into redactions (versions) amounts to one of the main textological problems of the novel, as different textologists single out from three to eight possible redactions of the manuscript. Having researched Bulgakov's archive, Belobrovtseva and Kuljus, as well as Chudakova, agree on eight redactions to be considered.

The analysis of the critical works by Barratt, Belobrovtseva and Kuljus, and Chudakova, helped outline one of the major reasons for the appearance of a number of translations - the textological issue of the novel. Working on critics' stipulations on the data from the archives, I certainly was aware that my corpus has to consist of primary sources in order to conduct a proper analysis. Continuing my research on the critical side, I looked with greater attention at the original text as well as its translations into English, trying to recreate the whole picture.

English Translations

As St-Pierre so accurately pointed out, "translation is a form of cultural practice […] it's necessary to examine the conditions under which such texts are made available" (61).

Before the publication of *The Master and Margarita* in 1967 by Grove Press, very few people outside of the Soviet Union had heard of Mikhail Bulgakov. Although *The Master and Margarita* was spared the sensation caused by the works of Solzhenitsyn and Pasternak in the West, its influence spread over the years and it is now considered a highly appreciated literary work, included into the curriculum of many courses of Russian and World literature in the West. Part of the "not-so-big appearance" of the novel has to do with the novel's complex history, as well as its translation and interpretation by the critics. Knowing that Ginsburg's and Glenny's translations were so different, but were published the same year made me investigate further in an attempt to find out the reasons for this.

It turned out that the translators worked from two different texts. The first translation of the novel for Grove Press in 1967 was prepared by Mirra Ginsburg and lacks the portions removed by the Soviet censor. A more complete translation, with the additional passages, presumably sent to the West by Bulgakov's wife, was seen soon after - in Michael Glenny's translation for Harper and Row. The authorship of the full Russian text and additional passages is questionable, since according to Barratt, Glenny's translation has "some three hundred examples of a mismatch between the Russian and the English [texts]" (75).

In 1967, after his translation was published, Glenny predicted that "volumes and volumes of criticism and exegesis will be written on it in years to come" (qtd. in Barratt 2) and he was absolutely right. The editions of Bulgakov's work from 1973 and 1989 caused the appearance of new translations by Diana

Burgin and Katherine Tiernan O'Connor (Ardis, 1995), Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky (Penguin, 1997), Michael Karpelson (Lulu Press, 2006), Hugh Aplin (One World Classics, 2008).

Thus, following St-Pierre, translation can be regarded as "a discourse … dependant upon laws and rules which determine not only what can be said but also the way in which it can be expressed (St-Pierre 62)." Therefore the perception of the novel or absence of such is directly interconnected with all the factors mentioned.

Prefaces and their Importance

Having familiarized myself with several translations of Bulgakov's novel, I decided to do my best to hear the voice of the translator. The best way to do it is to refer to the preface. I usually find it not only a useful addition to the book, but also a translator's personal message to the reader, where s/he can communicate and express the choices s/he has made. I see the prefaces to the translations as very helpful in the reconstruction of a wider picture of the translation process through history. St-Pierre said:

> [T]he aims stated in the preface point to what was considered to be relevant in the production of a translation, which is why the translator refers to them. It is precisely their conventional nature which is important for us, since the aim is to determine the values dominant within a specific period. (St-Pierre 70)

Presenting her personal point of view, Ginsburg gives her own directions and explanations of the translation to the future reader, making them aware of the problematic moments, but not the circumstances, surrounding Bulgakov's novel.

Thus, Ginsburg did not want to acknowledge the involvement of Bulgakova into the publication process, as well as her right to change or add things. As Ginsburg's preface says:

> If the reader finds an occasional minor inconsistency in the text, it is attributable to the fact that the author didn't prepare the book for publication, and the editors chose to publish the novel as Bulgakov left it. (Ginsburg vii-viii)

From the data above it is only too evident that Ginsburg is either unaware of the whole picture or prefers to see it this way.

It was interesting and surprising for me to see that Glenny, contrary to other translators of the novel, did not provide any translator's notes. My speculation is that he probably thought that his translation is strong enough to speak for itself, without any need for explanations.

Diana Burgin and Catherine O'Connor in their preface emphasize the importance and relevance of their translation, saying that they did their best "to produce what has been lacking so far: a translation of the complete text of Bulgakov's masterpiece into contemporary standard American English". Presenting a more contemporary view on the translation process and feeling the necessity to justify their style, Burgin and O'Connor "have made every effort to retain the rhythm, syntactic structure, and verbal texture of Bulgakov's prose." Going into detail, they go on to say that they "have often eschewed synonyms in favor of repeating the words that Bulgakov repeats" (assuming Bulgakov repeated them for a reason), trying "without sacrificing clarity, not to break up Bulgakov's long sentences and to adhere to his word order" (Burgin and O'Connor 1).

It is especially evident in the translations starting in the 1990's that translators are more willing to connect to the reader of the text. They are more willing to explain where the difficulties might occur, and how they worked toward sorting them out.

Looking for an explanation for the trend, I came across the hypothesis that part of the reason for this is that after the 1990s there were already several translations of the novel circulating, and the reader was already puzzled and confused when in the position to choose. That made a preface not optional, but rather absolutely necessary. Therefore, the translators tried to do their best to clear up the confusion (at least partially) and to draw readers' attention to a particular translation.

Bulgakov's text is known for wordplay and allusions that are sometimes hard to understand even for a Russian reader. Unsurprisingly, some of those features are lost in translation and affect the literary flair of the text, as well as deprive the foreign reader of the rich historical context of the novel and of its sophisticated humor. However, it is only in Burgin and O'Connor's translation that the reader finds annotations and an afterword by Ellendea Proffer. In the note on the text Proffer familiarizes the reader with the fact of the existence of several redactions, and how it could have affected the original text, and therefore its translations. Her commentary on the text is not exhaustive, as she states that "names which are easily looked up in any encyclopedia are not glossed" (Proffer 337). Looking through her commentary to the first two chapters, I found it very useful for the English speaking reader. I would consider it a necessity to have

either an afterword commentary or footnotes as part of any translation of Bulgakov's novel into a foreign language.

Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky, outlining the textological differences in the preface to the novel, admit that having no "definitive authorial text the process of revision is virtually endless". However, they claim that usually it "involves changes that in most cases have little bearing for a translator". They state the following: "The present translation has been made from the text of the original magazine publication, based on Elena Sergeevna's 1963 typescript, with all cuts restored". They claim it is "complete and unabridged" (Pevear and Volokhonsky xix). What I find valuable about Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation is that it also includes an introduction.

Thus, the prefaces to translations helped me open up what was "considered to be relevant in the production of a translation", which enables better understanding of the cause of the perception of a particular translation at a particular time period (St-Pierre 70).

Best Translations

My next step in the research process was to find out the general opinion on the translations. With so many translations circulating, I chose to focus on three translations singled out by critics and foreign readers.

There are many debates, both online and in print, about the best translation of the novel. However, most of them fail to stress the important fact that some of the translations, assessed in blogs, websites, and articles, are from different time periods and different manuscripts. Therefore, their comparison is not justified.

This puts a reader in a very disadvantaged position. However, I feel obliged to present the most widespread view on the most appreciated or wide-spread translations available. A book section in a popular on-line English-language publication *Russia!Magazine (Russia!Magazine)* published "The Great Translation Chart" in which the critics' opinions on some of the most wide-spread translations in the English-speaking world are given. "The Great Translation Chart" gives the first rating to Mirra Ginsburg's translation, then Michael Glenny's, and Burgin and O'Connor's, accordingly. As the on-line sources did not seem enough for a justified critical opinion, I started looking into other critical reviews on the translations of the novel.

What I found interesting during my search for criticism is Korney Chukovsky's impression after reading both Ginsburg's and Glenny's translations. Korney Chukovsky is one of the most popular children's poets in Russian. He was also a well-recognized literary critic and essayist. With a superb knowledge of English and experience as a translator, Chukovsky is the critic whose opinion on translations is especially valuable. Chukovsky, in correspondence with American Slavists, commented on the two translations, that were available by then, Ginsburg's and Glenny's. He said that he was looking closely into the translations by Ginsburg and Glenny and admired Ginsburg's resourcefulness in translation of the Russian idioms. At the same time he is very harsh in his judgment towards Glenny's translation. Chukovsky notes many blunders in Glenny's work and calls him "a hack worker, who doesn't know Russian well" (my translation) (Chukovsky).

Chukovsky sees Ginsburg as an artist, and it is hard not to accept his point of view. Ginsburg won critical praise for her work on translation of adult novels, stories, and anthologies, among them *We* (1972) by Yevgeny Zamyatin, Dostoyevsky's *Notes from Underground*, as well as additional works by Bulgakov, Singer, Babel and Zoshchenko. She is also known as a children's writer. She adapted and translated into English both Russian folktales and those of other peoples. She also wrote "folktales" of her own ("Mirra Ginsburg").

Looking for a wider critique of the novel, I looked into Rachel May's view on the translations. She seemed like a reliable critic, a Professor of Russian Literature at Macalester College, Texas. She is also known as a translator. May, in her article "Three Translations of *The Master and Margarita*" compares the three most popular (for different reasons) translations of the novel, those by Ginsburg, Glenny and Burgin and O'Connor. The first translation by Ginsburg is unanimously recognized by the critics as the best literary text. However, as May puts it "[t]he devil only knows why [she] never updated her version to include the missing material--perhaps the work of diabolical copyright attorneys or the sinister machinations of publishers" (May 33).

The translator's note from one of the contemporary near-unanimous academic choices, that by Diana Burgin and Katherine O'Connor, states that the translated text aimed "to produce what has been lacking so far: the translation of a complete text of Bulgakov's masterpiece into contemporary standard American English" (Burgin vii). May pays most tribute to Ginsburg for the literary flair;

however, she points out the main drawback of her translation – the omissions. May disapproves of Glenny's "serious mistranslations, omissions, and a general tendency to eliminate narrative intrusions and paradox, which are lynch pins of Bulgakov's humor" (May 31). She admits good scholarly work by Burgin and O'Connor and justly sees their version as more complete, close to the original; however, at times "too explicit" (33).

The numerous blogs and websites on *The Master and Margarita* also attracted my attention, some of them more than others. *Gypsy Scholar,* a blog on history, politics, literature, religion, and other topics, investigates the textological problematics of the novel. It, too, compares the same three translations – by Ginsburg, Glenny and Burgin and O'Connor. Their conclusion reveals an interesting case. Ginsburg and Glenny were both translating in 1967, and, it is safe to assume that, as competitors, they may have worked independently from one another. As my earlier research shows, they also probably worked from different versions of the text. Comparing the verbal similarities and differences in the three translations demonstrates a degree of dependence of Burgin and O'Connor's translation upon both Ginsburg's and Glenny's text. What the author of the blog stresses, and where I would definitely side with him, is that in their "Translator's Note", Burgin and O'Connor did not even slightly acknowledge owing any debt to any previous translations ("Bulgakov: Three Versions of Hell …").

Gypsy Scholar also gives reference to the translation of the novel by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky as one that is recommendable. On the

strength of what Gypsy Scholar had written I have intended to analyze this translation in Chapter II of my study, together with the three other translations: by Ginsburg, Glenny and Burgin and O'Connor.

Such a wide range of opinions and critical information on different translations made me look into the biographies of the translators in an attempt to understand how their personalities and background influenced their work, if at all. My interest was triggered by the fact that for some of the translators of *The Master and Margarita* translation was not their only occupation. It also made me wonder if that was a factor in their translation and to what degree.

During my study of the criticism on the translations, I often asked questions about the subjectivity of the researchers. It happened not because I wanted "to debunk their findings as mere opinions" (Pym 37). It helped me better appreciate their reasons for the positions they had taken up. Whether agreeing or disagreeing with them, I did my best to "look at the world through their eyes" (Pym 37). That helped me to avoid trying to find "right" or "wrong", but rather try to enter or contribute to the dialogue. I find that subjectivity is really good for research. It helped me promote self-criticism and greater insight into what I am studying, as well as helped me start questioning other researchers (Pym 37).

Translators

Mirra Ginsburg

Ginsburg is known as a Russian-American translator and adaptor of folk tales. Ginsburg was born in Russia into a literary family, and in her teen years

immigrated to Canada, and later to the United States. She is considered to be bilingual, which explains her good translations ("Mirra Ginsburg"). However, and Pym supports this point of view, linguistic competence is not everything, and "interculturality should not be equated with degrees of bilingualism" (Pym 183). It is difficult to define interculturality. It is difficult to be a person "happy to work and stay in an intersection" (184). Nonetheless, I would side with Chukovsky and others in defining Ginsburg as an intercultural translator more than any others.

A look into Ginsburg's personality and her unique position within two cultures and literatures pushed me into taking a closer look into the personality and background of other translators of the novel. I remembered the words of D'Hulst about the importance of the figure of a translator in doing translation history. He said that the analysis of the personality of the translators reveals "cultural forces determining the translating skills" (D'Hulst 25).

Michael Glenny

There is very little information available on Michael Glenny,[1] and my only source turned out to be *Wikipedia*. However, it still was useful, explaining why Glenny's translation is more modern but lacks the literary flair Ginsburg is praised for, even though Glenny is recognized as a noted translator of Russian literature into English. Glenny earned his Master's degree in Modern Languages followed by postgraduate degree in Soviet studies during his ten years in the British army. After that, he left the army to go into business. It was as a salesman

[1] Michael Glenny. *Wikipedia*.

that he first visited the Soviet Union. With this information, I do not mean to underestimate Michael Glenny as a scholar or a translator. His translations include works by Gogol, Dostoevsky, Solzhenitsyn and others. However, his later encounter with the language in the Soviet Union partially explains the difficulties he was having with the language: for example, the omission of passages whenever the situation is ambiguous or difficult to render. However Glenny's work as a coauthor and writer explains the good flow of his translation, appreciated by the English readers and making many of them opt for his version, as they characterize it as "more natural and less stilted", conveying "the essence of the screwy world" Bulgakov was portraying ("So you'd like to …"). Moreover, the fact that he has such a diverse background could have affected him in a positive way, not "restrict[ing] the ability … to challenge power structures". Probably that is precisely why he was able to do more than translate (Pym 164).

Burgin and O'Connor

Even less information is available on Diana Burgin and Katherine O'Connor. There is a small passage in *Wikipedia* that says that Diana Lewis Burgin,[2] an author and a Professor of Russian has been teaching Russian at University of Massachusetts, Boston since 1975, also mentioning her two translations - *The Master and Margarita* by Bulgakov and *Alexander Blok as Man and Poet* by Korney Chukovsky.

[2] Diana Lewis Burgin. *Wikipedia*.

Burgin's co-translator, Katherine O'Connor, enjoys even less attention. I was only able to find a reference to her book, *Boris Pasternak's My Sister - Life: The Illusion of Narrative*.

I was genuinely surprised, since I was expecting more visibility of the figure of the translator from translations coming from the 90s.

Initially restricting my research to the three translations mentioned above, in the process of research I became more determined to include the information on the contemporary translators, Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky.

Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky

There is more information on Pevear and Volokhonsky than on any other translator of *The Master and Margarita.* This amazed me and made me investigate further into their biographies. This is an interesting case of collaborative work. Pevear and Volokhonsky are a couple who are best known for their translations of works from Russian into English. They have become more popular on the North American Continent recently, especially after Oprah Winfrey chose their translation of *Anna Karenina* as a selection for her "Oprah's Book Club" on her television program (*"Oprah's Book Club"*). This led to a major increase in sales of this translation and greatly increased recognition for Pevear and Volokhonsky.

As opposed to Burgin and O'Connor, Pevear and Volokhonsky[3] are visible translators, which is obvious by their participation in *Ideas,* the long running *CBC* radio documentary and by their appearance in New York Public Library in conversation with Keith Gessen: celebrating the translation of *War and Peace* . I find it fascinating how they work together on translations (Larissa is a native Russian speaker). Volokhonsky prepares her English version of the original text, following Russian syntax as closely as possible, and Pevear polishes it and turns it into the appropriate English. This is how Pevear described their working process:

> Larissa goes over it, raising questions. And then we go over it again. I produce another version, which she reads against the original. We go over it one more time, and then we read it twice more in proof. ("Pevear and Volokhonsky")

The collaboration proved to be successful and explained why the couple has won several translation prizes.

In the very beginning of my research I assumed that a wide range of translations should come from the complexity of the original. This speculation encouraged me to turn to a closer analysis of the history of the creation of the novel and the translations available.

In the process of doing the history of translation, I found myself following Pym's method, of first doing the archeology of translation, that is looking into

---

[3] Pevear Richard and Larissa Volokhosky. *Wikipedia*.

"who translated what, how, where, when, and with what effect" (5). Part of my research process was criticism. Under criticism I understand not only what Pym saw as "assess[ing] the way translations help or hinder progress" (5), but also the study of different critical approaches, and working on my own subjective point of view. Explanation was an integral part of my research. In Pym's view, the notion of explanation means an attempt "to say why archaeological artifacts occurred when and where they did, and how they were related to change" (6). Explanation, directly interconnected with causation, helps us understand why the texts occurred.

Insight into an outstanding personality and complicated life story of Mikhail Bulgakov opened up the deep historical context of *The Master and Margarita*.

Situating the novel historically has also contributed to the unraveling of some of the mysteries of its creation that are directly interwoven with the body of the text itself. Looking into the time period when the novel was written, published, and distributed has helped to understand both the political implications of the novel and the issues connected with its publishing.

Looking at the history of the creation of the novel, I have been researching what has been written on translations – reading historical work and criticism. The works of Belobrovtseva and Kuljus, as well as Barratt, and Chudakova, helped me discover one of the main reasons for the complexity of the novel – its complex textology and , therefore, the existence of so many translations.

The modern critical sources, such as blogs and web-sites, helped me restore the picture of modern readers' views on the variety of the translations of the novel. The study of the life and work of the translators has provided me with better understanding of the linguistic choices they have made. Criticism, historical work, biographies, memoirs – all of these became part of my corpus, helping to restore the wider picture of the creation of the novel.

With my research into the history of the creation of the novel I aimed at the "best possible reconstruction of the past" (D'Hulst 31), which fulfilled its purpose and helped explain both the complexity of the novel and the existence of its numerous translations.

Chapter II: Analysis of the Translations

The Master and Margarita is a translation riddle, rich in allusions, implied situations and ideas, and word play. In an attempt to critically look at the novel and to see how the translators went through the translation process, I decided to compare four translations of the novel: that by Mirra Ginsburg, Mikhail Glenny, and Diana Burgin and Katherine O'Connor and Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky.

For my comparative translation research, I decided to analyze the first chapter of the novel. I consider the first chapter to be fundamental to any book, since it sets the tone of the narrative, and it is here that the reader either stays with the book or drops it altogether.

Also important is that the first chapter of the novel was not censored. So, regardless of the publication date of the book, the reader has access to Bulgakov's full text, as opposed to other parts of the book that were heavily censored at the earlier publication dates.

The first two translations by Ginsburg and Glenny come from the same time period. The third translation, by Burgin and O'Connor was done in 1995, so I assumed it has to differ from the other two. The translation by Pevear and Volokhonsky was published in 1997. The analysis of different translations will help me to attain a better understanding of the translation practices and to see theoretical basis as a helpful tool in analyzing as well as doing translation.

My choice of translations was determined by my research results in the history of the creation of the novel. My first choice was Mirra Ginsburg's

translation, the first of the 1967 translations available as stated earlier. The translation lacks the portions removed by the Soviet censor. However, this fact does not concern my analysis, since the first chapter was not censored. "The Great Translation Chart" (*Russia! Magazine!*) gives pride of place to Mirra Ginsburg's translation, then to Michael Glenny's and to Burgin and O'Connor. References to and high evaluations of a more recent translation, that by Pevear and Volokhonsky can be found in many on-line resources.

Time periods

The first two translations by Ginsburg and Glenny come from the same time period – both translations were published in 1967. During this time the ruling concept in translation was equivalence. Translating was seen as "a process of communicating the foreign text by establishing the relationship of identity or analogy with it" (Venuti 147).

The 1950's and early 1960's marked the linguistic approach to translation theory, focusing on the key issues of meaning, equivalence, and shift. In linguistics we find works of Jakobson, Nida, Newmark, Koller, Vinay, and Darbelnet and Catford. These theorists were more concentrated on the structural side of the language. It is only later that some theorists (Vermeer, Katharina Reiss, and others) began to realize that language is more about the way it is used in a given social context.

I assume that at the time the novel was translated, the structural approach of Roman Jakobson was still very influential in both linguistics and translation

theory. Jakobson in his 1959 essay "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation" described translation as a process of recording which involves "two equivalent messages in two different codes" (Jakobson 114).

Jakobson sees meaning and equivalence as integral parts of interlingual translation that "involves two equivalent messages in two different codes" (Jakobson 114). Jakobson claims that "concepts may be transferred by rewording, without, however, attaining full equivalence." His theory is linked to grammatical and lexical differences between languages, as well as to the field of semantics ("Linguistic Approach to Translation Theory").

The theories of 'shift' were introduced about the same time in works of Vinay and Dabelnet and Catford. Venuti claims that "[t]ranslation theories that privilege equivalence must inevitably come to terms with the existence of 'shifts' between the foreign and translated texts" (148).

Vinay and Darbelnet state that "[e]quivalence of messages ultimately relies upon an identity of situations". Vinay and Darbelnet in their essay *A Methodology for Translation (1958)* identify two translation techniques that somewhat resemble the literal and free methods: direct, or literal translation, and oblique translation (Vinay and Darbelnet in Venuti 128).

Equivalence is also a preoccupation of the American translator Eugene Nida, who rejects the "free" versus "literal" debate. Nida advocates for the concept of formal and dynamic equivalence. The main principles of Nida's

theory are expressed in his essay *Priciples of Correspondence (1964).* Nida begins his essay claiming that "no two languages are identical […], it stands to reason that there can be no absolute correspondence between languages. Hence, there can be no fully exact translations" (Nida 153).

The notion of "shifts" was further developed by Catford. Catford defines shifts as "departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL (source language) to the TL (target language)" (Catford 141). Such "departures" occur at different linguistic levels: graphology, phonology, grammar, and lexis. In his essay *Translation Shifts (1965),* he identifies two types of shifts: level shifts and category shifts.

In the 1970s, "skopos" theory was introduced to the translation field by Hans Vermeer. In "skopos" theory, the purpose of the translation and the function that it is going to fulfill in the target language comes to the fore. The translator is free to use different strategies in order to "reach a 'set of addresses' in the target culture" (Venuti 223). "Skopos" theory met with much criticism, since it was seen to be more business oriented and valid only for non-literary texts (Munday 81). Nonetheless, it is very important for translation practices since it gives freedom to the translator to translate the same text in a number of ways.

A most common theoretical assumption of the 1980s denotes the relative autonomy of the translated text. A very influential figure of the time was Antoine Berman. In his paper, *Translation and the Trials of the Foreign (1985),* he claims that the main ethical aim of translation should be "receiving the Foreign as a

Foreign" (Berman 277). Berman advocates for the translation that "enlarges, amplifies and enriches the translating language" (Berman qtd. in Venuti 225). Berman takes a rather radical attitude on translation practices and views the methods used by translators as 'textual deformation' (278) – deviations unable to reflect the original's spirit. Berman singles out twelve deforming tendencies that affect the ST.

In the 1990s, the time when the two of the most recent translations of *The Master and Margarita* (that of Burgin and O'Connor and of Pevear and Volokhonsky were published) theoretical approaches to translation multiplied.

The question of domestication and foreignization has always been one of the pressing issues in translation practices. However the 90s seem to privilege the strategy of foreignization due to the cultural identity that came to the fore. I would like to first clarify the two terms. Domestication presents a type of text that reads fluently, making an impression that it reflects the foreign writer's intention or the essential meaning of the foreign text. In other words, it gives an impression that the translation is not a translation, but the "original" (Venuti qtd. in Munday 146). As opposed to domestication, foreignization 'entails choosing a foreign text and developing a translation method along lines which are excluded by dominant cultural values in the target language' (Venuti qtd. in Munday 147). Venuti advocates for the foreignizing method, since, as he says it is 'highly desirable to restrain the ethnocentric violence of translation' (Venuti 147).

I assume that my analysis will show which principle, either domestication, or foreignization, was predominant in a particular translation. I also think that

some of the theoretical frameworks outlined above will help me do my analysis more efficiently.

Russian Text	Glenny	Ginsburg	Burgin and O'Connor
1. …Так кто ж ты, наконец? – Я – часть той силы, что вечно хочет зла и вечно совершает благо. Гете, «Фауст»	'Say at last – who art thou?' 'That Power I serve Which will forever evil Yet does forever good." GOETHE, Faust	"Who art thou, then? "Part of that Power which eternally wills evil and eternally works good." Goethe - Faust	…and so, who are you, after all? - I am part of the power which forever wills evil and forever works good. Goethe's Faust

Pevear and Volokhonsky: '…who are you, then?'
'I am part of that power which eternally wills evil and eternally works good.'
Goethe, Faust

In the epigraph to *The Master and Margarita* the reader sees the reference to Goethe's, *Faust.* The Russian text uses contemporary language in rendering the epigraph. However, Glenny chooses old-fashioned English to communicate the same message in Russian. Both Ginsburg's, as well as Burgin and O'Connor's and Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation demonstrate loyalty to the ST, keeping the modern language use as well as the syntax of the sentence intact.

According to the translation techniques, outlined by Vinay and Darbelnet, all three translators, with a slight exception of Glenny, made use of literal or word-for-word translation (85-92). According to Nida, the translations above are the examples of formal equivalence that is source-oriented, revealing the form and

content of the original message (Nida 134-140). As opposed to these two translators, Glenny translates more freely. According to Berman the following deforming tendencies are obvious in Glenny's translation: the destruction of rhythm, linguistic patternings, and vernacular networks or their exoticization. Berman also feels that rhythm is 'destroyed' by deformation of word order and punctuation, which is the case with Glenny's translation (Berman 288-297). His free approach to translation also destroys linguistic patternings due to the systematicity of the ST. Even though the destruction of vernacular networks or their exoticization is more common in relation to local speech, I see the use of modern language in the quote from Faust as part of the author's concept: to create a contemporary setting. Using older English, Glenny destroys Bulgakov's concept (Munday 149-150). In an attempt to understand Glenny's choice of words, I looked for other published translations of the excerpt. All of them use contemporary English:

Faust:

Well now, who are you then?

Mephistopheles:

Part of that Power which would

The Evil ever do, and ever does the Good ("The Alchemy Website").

I am willing to concede, though, that if Glenny used a published version of Goethe's text, then his choice is justified. On the whole, the equivalence of the message is for the most part achieved in all four translations.

Russian Text	Glenny	Ginsburg	Burgin and O'Connor
2. В тот час, когда уж, кажется, и сил не было дышать, когда солнце, раскалив Москву, в сухом тумане валилось куда-то за Садовое Кольцо,- никто не пришел под липы, никто не сел не скамейку, пуста была аллея (12).	It was the hour of the day when people feel too exhausted to breathe, when Moscow glows in a dry haze as the sun disappears behind the Sadovaya Boulevard- yet no one had come for a walk under the limes, no one was sitting on a bench, the avenue was empty (13).	At that hour, when it no longer seemed possible to breathe, when the sun was tumbling in a dry haze somewhere behind Sadovoye Circle, leaving Moscow scorched and gasping, nobody came to cool off under the lindens, to sit down on a bench. The avenue was deserted (3).	At a time when no one, it seemed had the strength to breathe, when the sun had left Moscow scorched to a crisp and was collapsing in a dry haze somewhere behind the Sadovoye Ring, no one came out to walk under the lindens, or to sit down on a bench, and the path was deserted (3).

Pevear and Volokhonsky:

> At that hour when it seemed no longer possible to breathe, when the sun, having scorched Moscow, was collapsing in a dry haze somewhere beyond Sadovoye Ring, no one came under the lindens, no one sat on a bench, the walk was empty (7).

This excerpt from the translation is presenting interest to me for several reasons. First of all, in the way the proper name is translated. Secondly, it is a rather long example in Russian, and to produce an equivalent translation, and at the same time keep the author's style, might have been a challenge for translators. The first translation, by Glenny, uses a free translation of the name of the street. "Sadovoye Koltso" (Russian: *Садовое Кольцо;*English literal translation: *The Garden Ring*) is a circular avenue around central Moscow. However, none of the translators kept the proper name intact through transliteration. All three translators demonstrated the use of the domesticating strategy, making the understanding of the text easier for the reader. Ginsburg, as well as Burgin and O'Connor and Pevear and Volokhonsky, tried to use the direct translation of the Russian "Koltso" (ring, circle) into English to hint at the type of avenue. Glenny's translation does not reflect the reality, as "Sadovoye Koltso" cannot be a boulevard, if a boulevard is defined as "a broad avenue in a city, usually having areas at the sides or center for trees, grass, or flowers" ("Boulevard"). "Sadovoye Koltso" is a "circular avenue consisting of seventeen individually named streets and fifteen squares" ("Sadovoye Koltso"). According to Nida all three translations are the examples of dynamic equivalence; that is, they are directed towards "the receptor response" and are "the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message" (Nida 162-163). However, Glenny's example doesn't fully fit into this pattern, representing an interpretive and liberal approach to translation. According to Berman the translations of the name "Sadovoye Koltso" will be representative of such a deforming tendency as qualitative impoverishment, that is, "the

replacement of words and expressions with TT equivalents “that lack their sonorous richness or, correspondingly, their signifying or "iconic" features” (Berman qtd. in Munday 159).

Ginsburg’s, Burgin and O’Connor’s and Pevear and Volokhonsky’s translations, in their attempt towards equivalence, are less domesticating than Glenny’s approach. According to Vinay and Darbelnet, they are the examples of literal translation, following such a translation procedure as calque (85-86).

Russian Text	Glenny	Ginsburg	Burgin and O’Connor
В тот час, когда уж, кажется, и сил не было дышать …	It was the hour of the day when people feel too exhausted to breathe …	At that hour, when it no longer seemed possible to breathe …	At a time when no one , it seemed had the strength to breathe …

Pevear and Volokhonsky:

“At that hour when it seemed no longer possible to breathe …”

Coming back to this example and trying to analyze the sentence to sentence equivalence of the text, I analyzed how the lexicon was rendered. The last two translations, by Burgin and O’Connor, and Pevear and Volokhonsky, seem to follow the literal mode of translation, advocated by Vinay and Darbelnet, using the literal or word-for-word procedure to render the message (86-88). The second translation is closer to this pattern, with the only exception being the use of a synonymous construction, which, however reaches the necessary effect. As to

Glenny's translation, according to Vinay and Darbelnet, he makes use of one of the oblique translation techniques, namely, modulation, to render the same message (89). According to Catford, what one observes in Glenny's translation is a structure shift (Catford 145). According to Berman, Glenny's translation is an example of expansion (Berman 290). This deforming tendency occurs, according to Berman, due to 'empty' explicitation that unshapes its rhythm, as well as to 'overtranslation' and to 'flattening'. Berman sees those effects as reducing the clarity of the work's 'voice' (Berman qtd. in Munday). As all three translations are slightly longer than the original, Berman's take on this would be that this tendency is more or less characteristic of all of them.

Thus one can see that Burgin and O'Connor, as well as Ginsburg to a slightly lesser extent, stay with the formal equivalence, while Glenny follows the dynamic equivalence pattern (Nida 134-135).

Russian Text	Glenny	Ginsburg	Burgin and O'Connor
- никто **не пришел** под липы, никто **не сел** не скамейку, пуста была аллея (12).	- yet no one **had come** for a walk under the limes, no one **was sitting** on a bench, the avenue was empty (13).	nobody **came** to cool off under the lindens, **to sit down** on a bench. The avenue was deserted (3).	no one **came out** to walk under the lindens, or **to sit down** on a bench, and the path was deserted (3).

Pevear and Volokhonsky:

> "… no one **came** under the lindens, no one **sat** on a bench, the walk was empty" (7).

To finish my analysis of this example, I would like to pay special attention to the translation of the last part of the excerpt. In the Russian text the verbs are used in their past perfective forms. The corresponding forms to Russian perfective verbal forms would be either the past tense or the past perfect. Therefore, according to Catford, shift of level is inevitable in translation (Catford 141-147). According to Vinay and Darbelnet, it is transposition (88-89). However, Glenny didn't stick to the shift of level, as he uses different verbal aspects, thus being inconsistent and not adhering to the ST. The above translation is representative of the expansion tendency, employed here for clarification. All four translations are exemplary of dynamic equivalence, and therefore of domesticating tendency in translation. This passage from the novel shows the reader the different linguistic choices made by the translators.

Russian Text	Glenny	Ginsburg	Burgin and O'Connor
3. Однажды весною, в час небывалого жаркого заката, в Москве, на Патриарших Прудах, появились	**At the sunset hour of one warm spring day** *two men* were to be seen at Patriarch's	**At the hour of sunset, on a hot spring day**, *two citizens* appeared in the Patriarch's Ponds Park (3).	**One hot spring evening, just as the sun was going down**, *two men* appeared at Patriarch's Ponds (3).

два гражданина (1).	Ponds (13).		

Pevear and Volokhonsky:

> **"At the hour of hot spring sunset** two citizens appeared at the Patriarch's Ponds" (7).

The translations above demonstrate a shift in category, namely a structure shift in all the translations. This is the most common form of shift. I assume that the shift happens due to the difference in word order in Russian and in English. According to Vinay and Darbelnet the example is representative of transposition, the oblique translation procedure (88-89). In Berman's typology of deforming tendencies, the translations are exemplary of rationalization: that is, changes affecting syntactic structures including punctuation, sentence structure and order (Berman in Munday 150). The beginning of the sentence (my highlighting) is representative not only of transposition and structural shift, in the first two translations, but also of expansion in the third example in an attempt to make the translation sound more natural. Therefore, all three translations achieve the effect of dynamic equivalence, sounding "appropriate to the receptor language and culture" (Nida 164). For the sake of objectivity, it has to be mentioned that the fourth translation, that by Pevear and Volokhonsky, is least of all effected by transposition and structural shift, and therefore can be categorized as representative of the foreignizing principle in translation.

This excerpt presents another example of the translation of proper names, that is, the Patriarch's Ponds. The Patriarch's Ponds are situated in a park very

close to Bulgakov's former residence in Bolshaya Sadovaya Street. The Russian name of this place is **Патриаршие пруды** (Patriarshiye Prudy) or *Patriarch's Ponds*, in the plural, though there is actually only one pond ("Patriarch's Ponds"). The example is interesting in that Ginsburg, following Berman's deforming tendencies, expansion and clarification, adds more information, which turns into 'overtranslation'.

Russian Text	Glenny	Ginsburg	Burgin and O'Connor
4. - Дайте нарзану, - попросил Берлиоз (2).	'A glass of lemonade, please,' said Berlioz (13).	"Give us some Narzan", said Berlioz (4).	'Give us Narzan water,' Berlioz asked (7).

Pevear and Volokhonsky:

'Give us seltzer,' Berlioz asked (7).

The example above presents a challenge for a translator. "Narzan" in Soviet/Russian reality is a carbonated mineral water with therapeutic effect. However Glenny translates the word as 'lemonade', that is "a drink made from lemon juice and sweetened water" ("Lemonade"). According to Vinay and Darbelnet, Glenny was trying to use the equivalence procedure of the oblique translation method (90). With the concept of such a drink unknown to a foreign recipient, Glenny decided to opt for something equivalent to Narzan. Oddly enough, Glenny considers it to be lemonade. I see this translation as a glaring example of domestication. According to Nida, this translation fits the definition of

dynamic equivalence (136-140). According to Berman, Glenny's translation follows the qualitative impoverishment deforming tendency (291-292), since Glenny replaces the word in the ST with its TT equivalent. However, this equivalent "lacks [the] sonorous richness" of the original (Berman qtd. in Munday 150). As to Ginsburg's, and Burgin and O'Connor's translations, they seem to be adhering to a foreignizing principle of translation, and, therefore to formal equivalence, leaving the cultural concepts of the ST intact. Following Vinay and Darbelnet typology, they translated 'Narzan' using the literal or direct translation method, and employing borrowing as a translation procedure (85).

Pevear and Volokhonsky translate 'Narzan' as 'seltzer', that is "water naturally or artificially impregnated with mineral salts or gasses; often effervescent; often used therapeutically" ("Seltzer water"*)*. I see this translation, following Vinay and Darbelnet's procedure of equivalence as a more successful example in comparison with Glenny's translation. Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation is thus characteristic of dynamic equivalence according to Nida, and qualitative impoverishment according to Berman.

Russian Text	Glenny	Ginsburg	Burgin and O'Connor
5. – Пиво **привезут** к вечеру, – ответила женщина (2).	'Beer'**s being delivered** later this evening', - said the woman (14).	"They'**ll bring** beer in the evening", said the woman (3).	"The beer **will be delivered** later", the woman answered (3).

Pevear and Volokhonsky:

" 'Beer'**ll be delivered** towards evening,' the woman replied" (7).

The example above (my highlighting) is characteristic of the level of shift. In Russian the message is rendered through the impersonal construction that is expressed in the language by using the verb in the third person plural and by the absence of the sentence's subject. The construction is, however, in the Active Voice. This construction is translated differently by the four translators. The first, Glenny's translation, employs the Present Continuous Tense, passive construction. The same technique is used by Burgin and O'Connor as well as Pevear and Volokhonsky, with the exception of the Future Tense. However, Ginsburg uses the Active Voice in order to render the message. According to Catford all three translations are representative of the shift of level (141-142). Due to the difference of grammatical structures in the two languages, the translations seem to be following the procedure of transposition. According to Berman, all three translations represent the rationalization deforming tendency (288-289). Although all four translations should probably refer to the dynamic equivalence model, it is Ginsburg's translation, in the Active Voice, that can probably belong to both.

From the native speaker's point of view, I can conclude that only Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation match what the Russian means "by this evening". The literal translation from Russian into English will be "toward the evening", which is how Pevear and Volokhonsky chose to translate it. However, I agree that translators had to employ different strategies for the English text for it to have

more of a literary flow, as this expression might sound a little bit odd to a native speaker of English.

Russian Text	Glenny	Ginsburg	Burgin and O'Connor
6. – Да, мы - атеисты,- **улыбаясь, ответил Берлиоз**, а *Бездомный* подумал, рассердившись: «Вот прицепился, заграничный гусь! (16)»	'Yes, we're atheists', **replied Berlioz smiling**, and *Bezdomny* thought angrily: 'Trying to pick the argument, damn foreigner. (18)'	"Yes, we are atheists," **Berlioz answered, smiling**, and *Homeless* thought angrily, "Latched onto us, the foreign goose! (9)"	"Yes, we are", **answered Berlioz with a smile,** while *Bezdomny* thought in irritation, "He's sticking to us like glue, the foreign pest! (7)"

Pevear and Volokhonsky:

> 'Yes, we're atheists,' Berlioz **smilingly replied**, and *Homeless* thought, getting angry: 'Latched on us, the foreign goose!'(12)

The example above presents a particular challenge to a translator. I would like to first analyze the use of the proper name *Бездомный* (my italics), which is here the last name of one of the characters. It is translated into English as 'homeless'; however, as it was already mentioned, it is a last name. There is usually a tendency in translation to transliterate them, which is completely in compliance with a foreignizing principle in translation. However, in Ginsburg's

work the last name is translated. One sees the same tendency in a more contemporary version, by Pevear and Volokhonsky. Following Nida's principle of dynamic equivalence Ginsburg, as well as Pevear and Volokhonsky, probably decided to render the telling nature of the last name. This translation will be, according to Berman, representative of clarification deforming tendency, as it includes explicitation, which "aims to render "clear" what doesn't wish to be clear in the original" (Berman qtd. in Munday 150).

As to the sentence structure, it gets altered in translation. Therefore, in all four translations one sees examples of transposition. Rationalization, together with expansion, lead to the destruction of linguistic patternings. While the ST is systemic in its sentence constructions and patternings, translation tends to be 'asystemic'. However, in making translations more homogeneous, the translator destroys the 'systematicity' of the original (Berman qtd. in Munday 150). Thus, according to Nida, the translation achieves dynamic equivalence (136-140).

Moving on to the translation of the idiomatic saying (the underlined phrases), I might admit that the analysis of the variants presented in the translations were of particular interest to me. Both Pevear and Volokhonsky as well as Ginsburg translated the saying in the same manner and in the same wording. They kept the wording intact, thus following word-for-word, or literal translation, sticking to the foreignizing principle. Their translation is characterized by formal equivalence. Burgin and O'Connor's translation is very similar to the two mentioned above. However, they used equivalent constructions, which makes a difference from a critical point of view. Their translation ["He's sticking to us

like glue, the foreign pest!"] is, first of all, the example of rationalization as the word "goose" is replaced by a more general word 'pest', meaning "an annoying person or thing; a nuisance" ("Pest"). Moreover, in the first part of the saying Burgin and O'Connor use "sticking to us like glue", which is more familiar to a foreign reader. Again, according to Berman, their translation represents the destruction of expressions and idioms, which Berman considers 'ethnocentrism' (295). He says that "to play with "equivalence" is to attack the discourse of the foreign work" (Berman qtd. in Munday 151). Thus Burgin and O'Connor follow the oblique translation method, employing the procedures of equivalence and partial adaptation in order to render the message. Their translation is representative of dynamic equivalence and, therefore of the domesticating principle in translation.

Ginsburg's translation of the idiomatic saying ['Trying to pick the argument, damn foreigner'] is, according to Berman, the example of such deforming techniques as clarification, expansion and qualitative impoverishment, all leading to the destruction of expressions and idioms (289-295). In an attempt to render the message, Ginsburg seems to be following the oblique method, namely the equivalence procedure. However, her translation is more explanatory in nature.

Russian Text	Glenny	Ginsburg	Burgin and O'Connor
7. - Взять бы этого Канта, да за такие	"Kant ought to be arrested and given three years	"This Kant ought to be sent to *Solovki* for three	"This guy Kant ought to get three years in

доказательства года на три в Соловки!- совершенно неожиданно бухнул Иван Николаевич (17).	in *Solovki* asylum for that "proof"' of his!" Ivan Nikolayich burst out completely unexpectedly" (19).	years for such arguments!" Ivan Nikolaevich burst out suddenly (10).	*Solovki* for proofs like that", blurted out Ivan Nikolaevich, completely unexpectedly (8).

Pevear and Volokhonsky:

> 'They ought to take this Kant and give him a three-year stretch in Solovki for such proofs!' Ivan Nikolaevich plumped quite unexpectedly (13).

In this example such culturally specific term as "Solovki" (my italics) is being translated. "Solovki" refers to the Solovki prison camp, later Solovki prison, that was located on the Solovetsky Islands, in the White Sea ("Solovetsky Monastery, Solovki"). Glenny's translation refers to the techniques of rationalization, clarification and expansion, translating it as 'Solovki asylum', thus, according to Berman, causing the destruction of linguistic patternings (293-294). Glenny's translation also leads to the distorting of Bulgakov's meaning and the loss of the "punch" of the original. He is also following Nida's dynamic equivalence method of translation, trying to make the text as transparent and clear for the target reader as possible. The two other translations, however, following the foreignizing principle, keep the cultural aspect intact using the procedure of borrowing and thus following formal equivalence model of translation.

Rationalization is the characteristic of all the three translations. Rationalization affects syntactic structures including punctuation, sentence structure and order. According to Catford, the translation is also affected by the shift of category (a structure shift) that involves a shift of grammatical structures, due to a difference in word order (143-147). According to Vinay and Darbelnet, this translation follows the oblique translation method, namely transposition, again due to the difference in grammatical structures of the two languages (88). Therefore, from the English examples, one could see that in English the subject of the sentence goes first as a rule, while in Russian the word order is relatively free. Moreover, in English active constructions are more frequent than passive and impersonal ones, while in Russian it is the opposite. The closest to the Russian grammatical model of rendering is Burgin and O'Connor's and Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation. As to the structural and syntactic aspects of translation, all the four of them can fit into the category of dynamic equivalence pattern in rendering the message of the ST.

Russian Text	Glenny	Ginsburg	Burgin and O'Connor
8. – А жаль! – отозвался задира-поэт (6).	'What a pity!' said the impetuous poet (20).	"A pity", the belligerent poet responded (8).	"Too bad!" responded the poet-bully (8).

Pevear and Volokhonsky:

'Too bad!' the feisty poet responded (13).

The example above is another example of rationalization, again due to the difference in word order and a shift of category (a structure shift). According to

Vinay and Darbelnet, it's the example of transposition, the oblique translation technique, characteristic of foreignization (88).

What is especially interesting about this example is the way **задира-поэт** (my highlighting) is translated. In the source text, it is a noun construction, which literally means 'poet-bully'. One can see that Burgin and O'Connor as well as Pevear and Volokhonsky, following Vinay and Darbelnet method of direct or literal translation, employ the procedure of word-for-word translation,- **poet-bully.** There is a change in the structure, and therefore a slight structural shift and transposition, since if they had followed it structurally, they would have ended up with, **- bully-poet,** which is against the syntactic and grammatical rule of the English language. Burgin and O'Connor should also be paid tribute for keeping the syntactic structure of the sentence, following the Russian model, and putting the subject at the end of the sentence. Thus it would be justified to say that Burgin and O'Connor, for the most part, followed the direct or literal translation and did their best to achieve formal equivalence.

In the other two translations, as well as in Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation, the complex noun **задира-поэт** is translated through adjective + noun construction. This change makes the shift of category, namely class shift, obvious. According to Catford, class shift is a shift from one part of speech to another (Munday 61). Here, a noun phrase is rendered through an adjectival construction.

In terms of syntax and structure all four examples demonstrate a shift in category, namely, a structure shift, since the structure of the English sentence, due to the predominance of the direct word order, dictated that choice to the translators.

Therefore, the translations, are examples of transposition, according to Vinay and Darbelnet (88), and are following the dynamic equivalence mode of translation (Nida 136-140). It is obvious that the syntactic structures, such as punctuation, sentence structure and order are changed from the ST. For example, nouns are translated through adjectives. Therefore, the translations seem to be affected by Berman's rationalization deforming tendency. Along with rationalization, the destruction of rhythm, due to the deformation of word order and punctuation, come into play.

Thus I can conclude that Burgin and O'Connor's translation is the only one leaning towards foreignization, while the other three under analysis are an example of domestication.

Russian Text	Glenny	Ginsburg	Burgin and O'Connor
9. Тут литераторы подумали разно. Берлиоз: «Нет, иностранец!», а Бездомный: «Вот черт его возьми! А?» (6)	Their reactions were different. Berlioz thought: 'No, he's a foreigner.' Bezdomny thought: 'What the hell is he … ?' (21)	The literary gentlemen had different thoughts. Berlioz said to himself, "No, he is a foreigner!" And Homeless thought , "The devil … have you ever!... "(12)	The writers had different thoughts at this point. Berlioz thought, "No, he is definitely a foreigner!" and Bezdomny thought, "Oh, to hell with him!" (9)

Pevear and Volokhonsky:

> Here the writers thought differently. Berlioz: 'No, a foreigner!', and Homeless:
> 'Well, devil take him, eh!...' (15)

The example above is another challenge to a translator, as it contains a colloquial expression in the ST. I would like to start my analysis with the first sentence. The first sentence is rendered literally by Pevear and Volokhonsky. It is a word-for-word translation. My assumption is that as Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation is the latest of the above in terms of publication, they were more adherent to the foreignization principle in translation. Thus, their translation is the example of formal equivalence. As to Glenny's translation (*Their reactions were different* (my italics)), according to Vinay and Darbelnet, it is the example of modulation, that is conveying the same idea using words or phrases different in the source and target languages (89). According to Berman, Glenny's translation is exemplary of rationalization deforming tendency (288-289). According to Catford, the reader can observe such shifts of category, as structure (a shift in grammatical structure) and class shifts (differently=>different). Glenny's translation is a vivid example of dynamic equivalence. It is oriented at the target reader, and reflective of the thought from the foreign reader's perspective, "That is just the way we would say it" (Nida 136).

Ginsburg's translation, even though using a different wording, is similar structurally to that of Glenny's. Burgin and O'Connor's translation, similar to the two mentioned above, is also characteristic of such a deforming tendency as clarification and expansion, having added the expression "at this point".

Another part of the excerpt «Нет, иностранец!» was again most literally translated by Pevear and Volokhonsky ("No, a foreigner"). It is a literal, word-for-word translation, following the literal (direct) translation method. Glenny's and Ginsburg's translations are identical in their wording ('No, he's a foreigner.'). These translations are oriented towards the dynamic equivalence, as opposed to Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation. Burgin and O'Connor's translation "No, he is definitely a foreigner!" is, following the above-mentioned translation patterns, the example of clarification and expansion, and is also a vivid example of dynamic equivalence, since this expression would be "the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message" (Nida 136).

Finally, the last example from the excerpt, being a colloquial expression, gave rise to a number of different translations. Surprisingly, Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation ('Well, devil take him, eh!...') again rendered the message literally, word-for-word, leaving the idiomatic expression intact. This made me think about recent translations following the foreignizing principle more closely. Their only deviation from the word-for-word procedure of literal (direct) translation was in the difference of rendering onomatopoeia "a" (Russian) versus "eh" (English). Here the translators employed the procedure of equivalence. According to Berman, such a transformation leads to qualitative impoverishment. It is interesting to look at the three other variants of translation:

Glenny: 'What the hell is he … ?'

Ginsburg: 'The devil … have you ever!...'

Burgin and O'Connor: "Oh, to hell with him!"

It is clear from the examples that all of them use equivalent constructions in the target language. According to Berman, their translations are the example of the destruction of expressions and idioms (295). The translations are also an example of rationalization, since all the three translators employ generalization, omitting the example of onomatopoeia in the ST. Thus, the conclusion is that all the three translation, characteristic of dynamic equivalence, are domesticating translations.

Russian Text	Glenny	Ginsburg	Burgin and O'Connor
10. - Вам отрежут голову! - А кто именно? Враги? Интервенты? - Нет,- ответил собеседник, русская женщина, комсомолка (20).	'Your head will be cut off!' 'By whom? Enemies? Foreign spies? 'No,' replied their companion, 'by a Russian woman, a member of the Komsomol.' (23)	"Your head will be cut off!" "And who precisely will do it? Enemies? Interventionists?" "No, replied the stranger, "a Russian woman, a member of the young Communist League (13)."	"Your head will be cut off!" "By whom, namely? Enemies? Interventionists?" "No", replied the interlocutor, "by a Russian woman, a member of the Komsomol (10)."

Pevear and Volokhonsky:

> 'Your head will be cut off!'
> 'By whom precisely? Enemies? Interventionists?
> 'No, replied his interlocutor, 'by a Russian woman, a Komsomol girl.' (15)

The question “А кто именно? Враги? Интервенты?” if translated literally, word-for-word, will coincide with either Burgin and O’Connor’s, or Pevear and Volkhonsky’s translation. They are closely following the ST in rendering the message. As to Glenny’s translation, the question omits the word ‘precisely’ which is not in coherence with the direct translation method. As to Ginsburg’s translation, it is affected by clarification and expansion deforming tendencies.

Coming back to Glenny’s translation, the word “интервенты” in his translation is “foreign spies”, whereas it has to be ‘interventionists’. This makes his choice hard to analyze altogether. I assume that Glenny made this translation choice because he felt that his readers would not know what he meant. By the time his translation was accessible to readers (1960s) the interventions by the English and French in the Russian Civil War would have been forgotten.

The last line of the excerpt in terms of structure and syntax was rendered more or less the same by the translators, leaving it intact for the most part. However, the word “комсомолка”, meaning a member of the Komsomol organization (female), was rendered differently.

The literal translation of the term was done by Pevear and Volokhonsky (‘a Komsomol girl’). Glenny as well as Burgin and O’Connor both translated the term as “a member of the Komsomol”, which is along the lines of the same idea, but makes the translation longer, which, according to Berman, leads to such a deforming tendency as expansion (290). Ginsburg translates the term as ‘a member of the young Communist League”, which is more of a clarification as

well as expansion character, and leans more toward the dynamic equivalence translation, and therefore towards domestication.

Russian Text	Glenny	Ginsburg	Burgin and O'Connor
11. – А у вас какая специальность? – осведомился Берлиоз. – Я – специалист по черной магии. «На тебе!» – стукнуло в голове у Михаила Александровича (7).	' And what is your particular field of work?' asked Berlioz. 'I specialize in black magic." 'Like hell you do!...' thought Mikhail Aleksandrovich (25).	"And what is your field?" asked Berlioz. "I am a specialist in black magic." "Now what!" flashed through the mind of Mikhail Aleksandrovich (15).	"And what is your field?" inquired Berlioz. "I'm a specialist in black magic". "Well I'll be ..." flashed through Mikhail Aleksandrovich's head (12).

Pevear and Volokhonsky:

'And what is your field?'
'I am a specialist in black magic.
'There he goes!...' struck in Mikhail Alexandrovich's head (17).

The first question 'А у вас какая специальность?' is translated similarly ("And what is your field?") by all the three translators, excluding Glenny. The translators follow the direct or literal method of translation; Glenny, however, deviates from this method, making his own additions for clarification purposes. As a result, his translation, according to Berman, is affected by clarification and

expansion deforming tendencies. I think that there is no particular reason Glenny should have used clarification in this particular instance.

The next line "Я – специалист по черной магии", was again literally translated ("I am a specialist in black magic.") by all translators except Glenny ("I specialize in black magic."). In Glenny's translation one could see a shift of category, namely of class, as he replaces a noun construction with a verb construction. It is transposition, which is a method of oblique translation usually typical of domestication (88). In terms of Berman's categories, this example is the example of rationalization, since a noun phrase is replaced by a verb phrase (288-289). Thus Glenny's translation fits the model of dynamic equivalence, while the other three - formal equivalence.

The last part of the excerpt *«На тебе!» – стукнуло в голове у Михаила Александровича* (my italics) is translated differently in all four translations due to its idiomatic nature. First of all, the expression *«На тебе!»* usually shows disappointment at the negative news one gets. Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation 'There he goes!...' seems to be the closest to the ST. Ginsburg's "Now what!" and Burgin and O'Connor's "Well I'll be ..." seem to step further away from the original message. However, it is Glenny who translated the idiom adding his own interpretation: 'Like hell you do!...'. According to Berman all three translations are affected by such a deforming tendency as the destruction of expressions and idioms (295), and are all done according to the oblique translation method – equivalence. However, it is Glenny's translation that is also affected by the destruction of vernacular networks and their exoticization. Berman

considers seeking a TL (target language) vernacular or slang equivalent as a 'ridiculous exoticization of the foreign' (Berman in Munday 151).

It seems like the last part of the phrase, that is, *стукнуло в голове у Михаила Александровича* (my italics) caused difficulty on the translators' part, as one could see variations of translations. To clarify the issue, I might admit that Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation again rendered the original message most precisely and literally, - *struck in Mikhail Alexandrovich's head* (my italics). Burgin and O'Connor translate the same message using a synonymous construction, which is not as precise as Pevear and Volokhonsky's, but renders the message quite closely to the original text, - *flashed through Mikhail Aleksandrovich's head*. The same refers to Ginsburg's translation, being very similar to the above-mentioned one: *flashed through the mind of Mikhail Aleksandrovich.* The only one that significantly differs from all the translations analyzed earlier, is Glenny's translation. As he simplifies the message: *thought Mikhail Aleksandrovich*. According to Berman, it is an example of rationalization deforming tendency, as Glenny obviously generalizes ST message, which deprives the reader of important information. His choice to simplify the message doesn't seem justified to me, or maybe he just wanted to achieve an easier flow of the text.

Russian Text	Glenny	Ginsburg	Burgin and O'Connor
12. – Я – историк, – подтвердил ученый и	"Yes, I am a historian', adding **with apparently**	"I am a historian", confirmed the	"Yes, I'm a historian," confirmed the

добавил **ни к селу ни к городу**: – Сегодня вечером на Патриарших прудах будет интересная история! (8)	**complete inconsequence**, 'this evening a historic event is going to take place here at Patriarch's Ponds (25).'	scholar, and added **irrelevantly**, "There will be a most interesting occurrence at the Patriarchs' Ponds this evening! (16)"	scholar and added, **apropos of nothing**, "This evening some interesting history will take place at Patriarch's Ponds (12)."

Pevear and Volokhonsky:

> 'I am a historian ', the scholar confirmed, and added with no rhyme or reason:
> 'This evening there will be an interesting story at the Ponds!'(18).

This example deals with another interesting case in translation. I will look into the translation of a colloquial expression as well as rendering a pun in translation. The expression **ни к селу ни к городу** (my highlighting) means in Russian to say something that doesn't make sense from a logical standpoint. One can see that Pevear and Volokhonsky's translation, using the equivalent expression in English, - **with no rhyme or reason**,- managed to render the message, even though, according to Vinay and Darbelnet, it employed the oblique method and the procedure of equivalence. According to Berman, they destroy the expression. However, I feel their translation successfully rendered the message. Burgin and O'Connor were also quite successful in finding the equivalent, - **apropos of nothing**, - and thus successfully rendered the ST message. However,

the other two other translations, by Glenny and Burgin and O'Connor, failed to communicate the same message. Having translated the expression using a synonymous expression, the effect of the original message is not rendered, and the idiomaticity is lost.

The theoretical basis for the translation analysis under discussion was formed by such theorists as Vinay and Darbelnet, Nida, Catford, and Berman. I tried to apply their framework, as well as to see how those theories were employed in the process of translation. For example, the theory developed by Vinay and Darbelnet was useful in terms of analyzing the structural side of the language in all four translations. Catford's theory of 'shifts' was useful in helping me to better understand which changes happen in the process of translation and how it affects the result. The theoretical framework of Vinay and Darbelnet and Catford made me realize how greatly the difference between languages affects translation and how translators are oftentimes forced to make some tough choices in the process. The theory of 'shifts' drew to the fore the structural difference of languages, and therefore the necessity of shifts in translation. The application of Nida's theory with the concepts of formal and dynamic equivalence stimulated my further interest in the question of domestication and foreignization, and this has also provoked a new perspective on the issue.

However, it is Berman's theoretical framework that had had a major influence on me during my work on Chapter Two. It made me reconsider the process of translation, as well as approaches to it. I agree with Berman, in that during the process of translation a great deal is inevitably lost, and Bulgakov's

novel is no exception. Reading its English translations, I came to understand that none are half as inspirational as the original. Berman advocates for foreignization. However he seems to have a very idealistic view of translation, seeing almost every translation practice as a 'deforming tendency'. It makes me come back to the words of another adherent of foreignization, Venuti, who seems to have a more realistic point of view on it. Venuti is adamant that translation can communicate to its readers the understanding of the foreign text that the foreign readers have. It is simply that this communication can never be fully reached (Venuti 487). Thus, I do not think it is possible for translations not to be affected by the so-called 'deforming tendencies'.

Apart from other theories involved in my analysis, I employed Berman's 'deforming tendencies'. However, looking back on it I must admit that the procedures, affecting and altering the source text according to Berman, can successfully be used by translators to better render the source text message.

The translation analysis makes me consider the principles of domestication and foreignization in translation once more, especially in light of the number of culture-specific items that were either domesticated or foreignized in Bulgakov's text. Domesticating translation is definitely a more accepted norm than foreignizing, for a number of reasons. However, what I have noticed is that translations by Burgin and O'Connor, and Pevear and Volokhonsky, published in the 1990s have a tendency to foreignize. I believe it was a growing trend in the 1990s, I believe we need to stimulate it, since it is important to retain the authenticity of the original. However, it is a very controversial issue, since, of

course, how readers will perceive a particular translation depends largely on the reader, whether s/he is ready to overcome the cultural divide and embrace the unknown.

This stipulation developed my thought in the direction of Vermeer and his theory. Even though I do not see its practical application to this particular text, I agree that it is very useful, for example, in considering the previous question of foreignization and domestication. Skopos theory gives freedom to a translator to use different strategies in order to render the message to the target audience. Moreover, skopos theory advocates for the existence of different translations of one and the same text, as the text can be translated in a number of ways depending on the goal of a translator.

My analysis shows that Burgin and O'Connor, and Pevear and Volokhonsky follow the strategies outlined by Vinay and Darbelnet, and their translations are affected by shifts of level and category. Even though following a direct translation method, it is inevitable that their translations will be affected by what Berman calls 'deforming tendencies' (Although at present, I would not agree with the word 'deforming'). However, my general conclusion is that out of the four translations analyzed in my research, Pevear and Volokhonsky, and to a lesser extent Burgin and O'Connor, following different structural strategies, managed to stay closer to the literal or direct translation, preserving both meaning and style of the original, which proves my point about the growing foreignizing tendency. They oriented their text toward a more culturally embracing reader.

While working on four translations, I was surprised to learn that only the translation by Burgin and O'Connor has a glossary. For a novel like Bulgakov's, it can be a serious deficiency or even a loss not to contain one. Taking into consideration the rich cultural and political context involved in the novel, paired with the number of allusions and word play, would make it absolutely necessary to have a glossary for every translation of this novel. The glossary is important not only for the explanation of culture-specific items, but also in relation to culture-specific idioms. Here I would like to recall Appiah's approach, that of translation as a form of cultural representation. The different ways in which concepts are translated have important consequences for the source culture. I agree with Appiah in that perfect translation is impossible. As Appiah says, "a translation [should] aim to produce a new text that matters to one community the way another text matters to another, but there can always be new readings, new things that matter about a text, new reasons for caring about new properties". Appiah advocates for "thick" translation. It is the translation that seeks with its annotations and its accompanying glossaries to locate the text in a rich cultural and linguistic context. From both a reader's and a translator's point of view, I see a glossary and/or annotations as necessary for locating the text in its rich historic and cultural context (Appiah 425).

Coming back to the analysis of the first two translations (Ginsburg's and Glenny's) I would like to continue with Ginsburg's. I agree with May, who gave Ginsburg tribute for the literary flair. However, as her text was an earlier one,

there are several things that should have been avoided in translation – for example, cases of clarification or expansion.

Glenny's translation is probably one of the easiest reads for a foreign reader. I would consider his translation a vivid example of Nida's dynamic equivalence. However in many cases I was unable to justify or explain his choice, or even apply a particular theory. This is due to omissions and generalizations but also sometimes even to free translation that Glenny does in his text. Vinay and Darbelnet's theory was helpful in analyzing Glenny's work, as Glenny made wide use of an oblique translation method, incorporating modulation, transposition, and equivalence in a lot of examples under analysis. I also applied Catford's theory, with shifts of category and class, to a lot of examples in Glenny's translation.

The above analysis makes me conclude that not only translators' abilities but their own translational approach can lead to different translations which affects readers' understanding not just of meaning but the artistry of the text itself.

Chapter III: *The Master and Margarita*: Cinematic Vision

What would your good do if evil didn't exist, and what would the earth look like if all the shadows disappeared?

--Mikhail Bulgakov

Chapter Three discusses a link between translation and adaptation. Specifically, I will focus on the recent TV adaptation of *The Master and Margarita* by Vladimir Bortko (2005). The Chapter provides extensive analysis of the scenes from *The Master and Margarita* adaptation using Patrice Pavis' methodology, in particular his discussion of the fidelity to the original text. In addition to Pavis, I will consider the writings by Walter Benjamin and Lawrence Venuti on translation as related to adaptation, as well as Linda Hutcheon's views on the problematic of both adaptation and translation. The works by Robert Stam, Geoffrey Wagner, Gerard Genette, Dudley Andrew and others will help to examine the evolution of adaptation criticism. I will consider Bortko's "autotextual" and "intertextual" mise-en-scène representation. A significant part of my analysis will also be devoted to the use of "ideotextual" mise-en-scènes in *The Master and Margarita*. This will demonstrate how the political implications of the TV mini series change the original message.

Linda Hutcheon points out that just as there is no such thing as literal translation "there can be no literal adaptation" (16). Translation from one text to another (transposition within the same medium) or from text to film (transposition to a different medium) inevitably brings change. In this situation, Robert Stam writes, "there will always be gains and losses" (qtd. in Hutcheon 16). As has already been pointed out in Chapter II, translation has always been imagined in

terms of equivalence and function. Equivalence is being translated as “accuracy,” “adequacy,” “correctness,” “correspondence,” “fidelity,’ or “identity.” Benjamin points out that translation cannot be compared to the original work since it is “a different effort all together” (Benjamin 80). The idea of fidelity or “faithful reproduction” does not seem to apply to translation in modern criticism. Benjamin sees translation as “harmony” between the two texts, their ability to engage and broaden each other (Benjamin 80). Venuti in his essay *Translation, Community, Utopia* outlines the more recent view on translation in 1990’s, drawing attention to the culturally oriented research in this area. He writes that there is a strong relation of texts with culture and ideology. This point of view signals a shift to a more broad and democratic approach to translation (Venuti 482-502).

According to Hutcheon, adaptation is a very specific type of translation – from one sign system to the other, from the sign system of words to the sign system of images, “transmutation or transcoding, a recording into a new set of conventions as well as signs” (Hutcheon 16). Adaptation is not just a reproduction of the original text; it is “repetition without replication” (Hutcheon 7). Hutcheon defines adaptation as follows:

- An acknowledged transposition of a recognizable other work or works
- A creative *and* interpretive act of appropriation/salvaging
- An extended intertextual engagement with the adapted work (Hutcheon 8)

Discussion of adaptation eventually returns to the problem of fidelity to a literary text. According to Stam, in viewer's terms "infidelity" usually refers to "the intense disappointment … when a film adaptation fails to capture what we see as a fundamental narrative, thematic, and aesthetic features of its literary source." One should not, however, consider it as a methodological principle. It is important to consider that when we are talking about novel to film adaptation, we are considering a change of medium, "[t]he shift from a single-track verbal medium to a multitrack medium." By "multitrack medium" we understand music, sound effects, images, etc. (Stam 3-4). There are different modes of engagement with a literary work, the telling mode (novel), the showing mode (plays and films) and the participatory mode (videogames). All of these modes allow interacting with stories differently. The telling mode "immerses us through imagination in a fictional world". While the showing mode "immerses us through the perception of the aural and the visual". The difference in the modes of engagement also presupposes the difference in perception. In the showing mode we face a "forward-driving story "direct perception – with a mix of both detail and broad focus." One should never expect the same results in terms of transposition or reception from different modes of engagement, as "[t]elling a story in words is never the same as showing it visually and aurally" (Hutcheon 22-23).

The Personality Factor

A very important factor that comes into play in any creative work, in any adaptation, is the personality of the creator, the adaptor. It has a major affect on

the artistic choices they make. Moreover, comparing the context of original Bulgakov's work and its ideology to the context and ideology of *The Master and Margarita* TV series, I was able to see how the director's own ideology is presented through the projection of particular messages that are important either for him or for the reigning power.

Vladimir Bortko was able to break the "curse" of *The Master and Margarita* in 2005 by the adaptation of the novel into a TV mini-series. Bortko has been a successful director since the popularity of *The Blonde from around the Corner* (Russian: *Блондинка за Углом*) in 1984. In 1988 his adaptation of Bulgakov's novel *Heart of a Dog* (Russian: *Собачье Сердце*) brought him recognition as well as Grand Prix Award in a movie festival in Perugia (Makarov). Bortko's reputation as a talented director of adaptation grew after the creation of the popular TV adaptation *The Idiot (2003)*, his adaptation of Fyodor Dostoevsky's novel. Not surprisingly, the responsibility for the adaptation of *The Master and Margarita* was entrusted to Bortko. Bortko says that he had ideas to film *The Master and Margarita* immediately after the success of *Heart of a Dog* in the late 80's, but at that same time another director, Elem Klimov, was working on the project, which stopped Bortko from following this idea. However, Klimov was never able to start the project due to financial constraints. Vladimir Bortko started working on the series in 2004, and was able to finish the 500 minute TV series in record time – 9 months, with the premiere released on the 19th of December 2005 ("Serial Master i Margarita").

The Master and Margarita TV series gathered an all-star cast. However, the "cursed" reputation of the novel seems to have left its trace here. At first Vladimir Bortko offered the role of Woland to one of the greatest contemporary actors, Oleg Yankovsky, who turned down the offer, being superstitious and reluctant to play the devil. Another well-known actor, Evgeny Mironov, declined the offer to play the Master, not feeling able to do justice to the role. The refusal of these talented actors however did not stop Bortko from the fulfillment of his project. Instead, actors popular in the 1970's - 1980's were invited to the project. Kirill Lavrov, Oleg Basilashvili, Valentin Gaft, Aleksandr Filippenko, Valery Zolotukhin, Roman Kartsev, Aleksandr Abdulov, Aleksandr Pankratov- Cherny represented Bulgakov's eternal characters in Bortko's screening. The younger generation of popular actors of the 2000's, like Sergey Bezrukov, Dmitry Nagiev, Vladislav Galkin, Anna Kovalchuk were probably selected by Bortko in order to attract a younger audience (Selivanova).

There is no denying the fact that the director's individual vision, including the political views, is reflected in a particular adaptation. This comment is relevant to the discussion, since politics seems to be an important part of Vladimir Bortko's life now. In 2006 Bortko became a member of the Communist party, for the second time in his life, 15 years after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Even though a member of the Communist Party, he seems ambiguous in his political views, probably due to the state support and the state order of such films as *The Idiot*, *The Master and Margarita* and *Taras Bulba*. Being against liberalism in his official statements, he seems to be the supporter of Putin, saying that "what is

common between Putin and Zyuganov [leader of the Communist Party] is their love for the Motherland" ("Vladimir Vladimirovich Bortko", my translation). Even though Bortko's most popular and successful adaptation, *Heart of a Dog*, was profoundly anti-Soviet, his views seem to have gone through a significant transformation over time. The use of ideological mise-en-scènes can be traced throughout Bortko's latest cinematic works. Bortko's latest film project, *Taras Bulba*, was recognized and awarded the revived Lenin Prize by the Communist Party of Ukraine in Kiev. It had drawn a very controversial response. Ukrainian nationalists consider it anti-Ukrainian. Bortko, who was raised in Ukraine, has the imperial view of seeing Russians and Ukrainians as one people, and therefore depicting them the way he did in his adaptation. He also supports his position by claiming that his adaptation is not only the representation of his personal point of view, but Gogol's vision as well.

Bortko himself outlined that *Taras Bulba* is "the direct expression of one of the important programs of the Communist Party, the one that concerns a pressing issue of today, that is the "Russian" issue and the issue of international relations as a whole". That is why Bortko recommends that "all communists watch this film" (*Slavyanskaya Evropa*, my translation). The politicization of the film became even more obvious after Bortko's interviews, where he pointed out to the fact that the goal of the movie is to make people think about the true meaning of life. In his opinion, what Andriy did in the movie (joining the Polish side) is caused not just by the love for the Polish *panienka*, but is representative of a deeper social phenomenon. Bortko's sees the main reason for Andriy's betrayal

in the temptation for a better lifestyle. That is why he portrays his treachery as quite painless and effortless. He also dresses him in chic armor to demonstrate the true reason for the betrayal. However, Gogol makes no hints about Andriy's mercenary spirit or search for profit and advantage. On the contrary, he emphasizes Andriy's overwhelming passion towards the beautiful woman:

> Our country is the one our soul longs for, the one which is dearest of all to us. My country is--you! That is my native land, and I bear that country in my heart. I will bear it there all my life, and I will see whether any of the Cossacks can tear it thence. And I will give everything, barter everything; I will destroy myself, for that country! (Gogol)

The 1962 adaptation of *Taras Bulba*, directed by J. Lee Thompson, follows the novel very loosely and has a poor script, but does not make any ideological assumptions. Moreover, Thompson foregrounds the lyrical part of the story, Andriy's love towards the Polish beauty. The love story between the Cossack and the Pole is made dominant to demonstrate what dominates in life, regardless of different factors, such as nationality or political views. This is supported by Gogol's scene of Andriy's death. When he is dying it is not the name of his mother or Motherland that he whispers:

> "Stand still, do not move! I gave you life, I will also kill you!" said Taras, and, retreating a step backwards, he brought his gun up to his shoulder. Andriy was white as a sheet; his lips moved gently, and he uttered a name; but it was not the name of his native land, nor of his mother, nor his brother; it was the name of the beautiful Pole. Taras fired. (Gogol).

Despite Bortko's attempt to present a politicized point of view, Andriy does not give the impression of a self-interested or mercenary-minded character but rather a brave man in love.

Throughout the movie Bortko makes attempts to emphasize patriotic and Orthodox religious motifs of the book. As a well-known political scientist T. Viktorov notices, Bortko deliberately omits the episodes of cruelty and mercilessness of the Cossacks and Taras Bulba. According to Viktorov, Bortko did not want to spoil the image of a noble Orthodox Cossack (*Slavyanskaya Evropa).*

Bortko tends to make his political views very explicit in his films. His individual reading always comes to the fore, expressing his point of view in a very straightforward and direct manner. No doubt, it is every director's right to do so. The only danger there is with the pictures portraying particular historical period and leaders is that they might give the not-so well-informed readers a one-sided interpretation of the time and events.

The Master and Margarita's riddle

Bulgakov's novel *The Master and Margarita*, presents considerable difficulty for adaptation. A fantasy novel with three different planes of reality, numerous complicated characters, and fantastic events occurring over a very short period of time, - all of which require an extraordinary vision, a talented script, and a decent budget to translate a multidimensional novel into a screen adaptation. Ekaterina Sukhanova writes that each of the three narrative planes (the biblical plane, the depiction of Bulgakov's contemporary Moscow, and Satan's visit to Moscow) requires a particular set of literary conventions, as it is precisely their "intersection that gives the novel its dynamic complexity" (76).

Over the years the novel has developed a mystical, "cursed" reputation. There have been several attempts to adapt the novel, none of which has been really successful. According to Lena Doubivko, Federico Fellini, Ray Manzarek and Roman Polanski were all captivated by the idea of the adaptation of this Soviet classic, but for various reasons never realized this ambition. In Eastern Europe, Andrzej Wajda and Aleksandr Petrović were more successful releasing their adaptations. However, they managed "derivative productions rather than definitive films: the Polish one focusing on the story of Pilate, and the Yugoslavian on the Moscow chapters" (Doubivko). In post-Soviet Russia Yuri Kara (1994) made an effort, but his version was not released until 2011 ("Master i Margarita - Yuri Kara").

The novel's prohibition until 1967 contributed to its cult status, with the "metavalue placed on the reader's personal experience, the privatization and simultaneous universalization of images glimpsed while reading, and the firm ascription to those images of the characteristics of inexpressibility" (Kaspe 27). Valery Todorovsky, one of the producers of Vladimir Bortko's *The Master and Margarita*, said in one of the interviews: "I cannot say that *The Master and Margarita* is a symptom of some kind of spiritual renaissance in our society. It is just... that the time has come to adapt it for the screen" (Barskova).

Bortko's adaptation followed Bulgakov's text rather meticulously. Certain scenes from the novel prove this point. The scenes employ "autotextual" and "intertextual" mise-en-scènes. According to Pavis, the "autotextual" mise-en-scène is the one strictly following the logic of the text, "with no references

beyond the text to confirm or contradict it". The "intertextual" mise-en-scène is "a mediation between autotextuality and ideological reference" (Pavis 37). Of course neither the adaptation of *The Master and Margarita*, nor any other contemporary adaptation will present any of these types in a pure form.

The Master and Margarita TV series: "intertextual" and "autotextual" mise-en-scènes

I would like to start with the intertextual adaptation. The opening scene plays a key role in setting the scene and foreshadowing various elements of the film that are going to come into play later. The opening scene of Bulgakov's novel as well as the TV series takes place at the Patriarch's Ponds in Moscow. Patriarch's Ponds (*Patriarshiye Prudy*; Russian: *Патриаршие прудьı*) is a residential area now in central Moscow. The name of the place dates back to 1610 when Patriarch Hermogenes [Germogen] chose this spot to build his residence. It was known as 'Goat Swamp' [Козье болото] (Larson 69). According to Peter Larson, it is a liminal space since its origin as a swamp, whose inhospitable territory was considered an "abode of demons" (Larson 69). What also contributes to this argument is that, according to Larson, Patriarch's Ponds is adjacent to the Great Garden Ring, which marked the borders of Medieval Moscow. Therefore, Patriarch's Ponds is a multi-layered space. On the surface, it is just a park in central Moscow. On another level it is "a liminal and ecclesiastical space", indicating the "edge of one space and the beginning of other", the place most suitable for the appearance of the Devil (Larson 70).

The opening scene of the movie shows the Patriarch's Ponds with the Devil entering the scene and predicting the death of Berlioz. It is highly symbolic that the conversation takes place at the Patriarch's Ponds since the major topic of the discussion is the denial of God's existence.

The opening scene in the novel starts with the same scene:

> At the hour of the hot spring sunset two citizens appeared at the Patriarch's Ponds. … Ah, yes, note must be made of the first oddity of this dreadful May evening. There was not a single person to be seen, not only by the stand, but also along the whole walk parallel to Malaya Bronnaya Street. At that hour when it seemed no longer possible to breathe, when the sun, having scorched Moscow, was collapsing in a dry haze somewhere beyond Sadovoye Ring, no one came under the lindens, no one sat on a bench, the walk was empty (Bulgakov, 1997 7).

Bortko renders the passage by showing, not by speaking. His adaptation "speaks without words, talks about the text thanks to a completely different semiotic system which is not verbal but 'iconic'" (Pavis 31). This is part of the charm of the visual medium. According to Vitez, the pleasure for the spectator always "resides in the difference between what is said and what is shown … what seems exciting for the spectator springs from the idea that one does not show what is said" (qtd. in Pavis 32). Even though I find Bortko's depiction of the Patriarch's Ponds rather successful, especially for the perception of those who do not know the novel, I believe, however, that a voiceover could be an option for the director to make the oddity of the surroundings more explicit. For example in his adaptation of Nabokov's *Lolita* (1997), Adrian Lynn retains a lot of Nabokov's text in the voiceover. The film opens with the same line as Nabokov's novel. Thus Lynn has the viewer focused on one of the most important aspects of the movie - the emotional state of the character. Lynn is concentrating on the explanation of the

almost detective story that unfolds. Bulgakov's story can be referred to a detective story to some extent as well. That's why it is particularly important to bring the viewer's attention to the place where the action will set out.

Costume also plays an important part in the opening scenes, as it helps to establish elements of the characters' personality at the very beginning of the film. Bortko does not follow the text directly in presenting the characters' appearance. The Devil in the TV-series is an older grey-haired man with a foreign accent, dressed in a black suit and carrying a walking-stick with a poodle head on top of it.

In the book however, it is different:

> [He] had platinum crowns on his left side and gold on the right right. He was wearing and imported shoes of a matching color. His grey beret was cocked rakishly over one ear; under his arm he carried a stick with a black knob shaped like a poodle's head. He looked to be a little over forty. Clean-shaven. Dark-haired. Right eye black, left – for some reason – green. Dark eyebrows, but one higher than the other. In short, a foreigner (Bulgakov 1997 10).

Even though the image of the devil is not rendered meticulously, the director is successful in presenting his own personal interpretation of the Devil's looks that gives the viewer the idea of who he really is. It is significant that Bortko chooses to depict the Devil in black instead of grey. Black has always had a particular dramatic symbolism. It has direct connotations with darkness, abyss, and hell. It means the denial of the light, the symbol of sin, nonexistence, and is associated with night, evil and demonic creatures. The color of coal, it refers one back to burning, and therefore to hell, having also an implication of revival. It communicates to the viewer a more direct visual message and foreshadows the

characters dark actions further within the film ("Chyorny tsvet"). Grey however is a more complicated color, not accidentally chosen by Bulgakov for the Devil. Grey symbolizes the space in-between, the combination of black and white, good and evil. In Biblical references, it is usually referred to ashes, mourning, and repentance.

Similarly, the appearance of both Berlioz and Bezdomny correspond to Bulgakov's description with a few deviations that are inevitable in such a case. Berlioz is dressed in all white, - white suit, white hat, shirt and shoes, probably indicating that he belongs to intelligentsia. Bezdomny, however, is represented more like a working class citizen, wearing "a checkered cap cocked back on his head", "wrinkled white trousers" (Bulgakov 7). Bezdomny's appearance is in clear contrast with the *intelligent* image of Berlioz. This is done deliberately to point out to their intellectual abilities as well as difference in status, indicating Bezdomny's role as "a proletarian poet".

The scene further develops into the dialog between Berlioz and Bezdomny, about the possible improvements of Bezdomny's anti-religious poem. The dialog is rendered by Bortko word for word, creating an "autotextual" representation. His choice is grounded, since the dialogue is emblematic of the anti-religious atmosphere in the society of the 1930's. Stalin had one of his main objectives the elimination of religion. Believers were ridiculed and harassed. One of the main targets was Russian Orthodox Church, since it had the greatest number of the faithful. The scale of the purges against the church is easily deducted from the numbers. According to the data from the Library of Congress

by 1939 only about 500 of over 50,000 churches remained open ("Revelations from the Russian Archives…").

Shortly another character joins Berlioz and Bezdomny's conversation. The topic of the conversation (whether the man can direct his own fate) is again very important for the whole novel. Bortko follows the text meticulously again depicting the scene autotextually:

> [Devil]: 'And generally [the man]'s unable to say what he's going to do this same evening.
> [Berlioz]: …'About this same evening I do know more or less certainly. It goes without saying, if a brick should fall on my head on Bronnaya …'
> [Devil]: 'No brick,' the stranger interrupted imposingly 'will ever fall on anyone's head just out of the blue. In this particular case, I assure you, you are not in danger of that at all. You will die a different death.'
> ….
> [Devil]: 'Your head will be cut off!'
> [Berlioz]: 'By whom precisely? Enemies? Interventionists?
> [Devil]: 'No,' replied his interlocutor, 'by a Russian woman, a Komsomol girl.' (Bulgakov 15) (Bortko, episode 1)

From the analysis above it can be deducted that the scenes under discussion demonstrate the combination of "autotextuality" and "intertextualty" in rendering the author's text.

The music to *The Master and Margarita* was written by Igor Kornelyuk, a popular Russian composer. The music refers the viewer to the main topic of the movie – Jesus, but the first scene where the characters deny the existence of Jesus and Satan, stands in contrast with the music. This is done to create more suspense and anticipation. It also foreshadows the darker events that are going to happen throughout the movie. *The Circus,* released in 1936, is exemplary of the Socialist Realist trend in cinema, with the narrative being foregrounded. It is propagandistic, supports the narrative and makes it transparent (Prokhorov 133).

As Dunaevsky, the composer of *The Circus* hit *The Song of the Motherland* (Russian: *Песня о Родине*) wrote to G. Alexandrov in the process of creating it: "The text must therefore be honed like a blade! The verse striking and clear! The music easily assimilated! The flow of the action (montage) simple and persuasive!" (qtd. in Salys 20). In *The Circus* the songs convey clear ideological message and are performed by the heroes (*The Song of the Motherland* with Martynov and Marion Dixon the lead singers, or the *Lullaby* (Russian: *Колыбельная*) sung in all the languages of the peoples of the USSR).

In *The Master and Margarita* TV series the message conveyed through the main soundtrack does not carry the same ideological load. However, the music in these two films is similar in that it supports the narrative, and makes the key theme transparent.

Bulgakov's View on Adaptation

Bulgakov paid particular attention to details. He considered details as important as the actors' play. Bulgakov had his own vision of how his works should be staged, therefore interpreted. One of his unfinished and unpublished until recently works, is called *Театральный роман (Teatral'ny Roman;* English: *Theatrical Novel*). It describes among other things the theatrical world, the "behind the scenes" life of the theatre. But what is even more important for this analysis is that it gives the reader the idea how talented Bulgakov was as a playwright. He had well-formed ideas about the interpretation of literary works on

stage. He was convinced that the actors selected for the play should correspond age-wise to what is depicted by the author:

> 'Just tell me just one thing,' I said impulsively, 'who was to have played Anna?'
> 'Ludmilla Pryakhina, of course.'
> This infuriated me.
> 'What? What!? Ludmilla Silvestrovna?!' I jumpewd out of my seat. 'You must be joking!'
> 'Why, what's the matter?' asked Bombardov with amused curiosity.
> 'How old is she?'
> 'That I'm afraid, is a mystery to us all.'
> 'Anna is nineteen! Nineteen! Don't you see? But that's not the point! The point is that she can't act!' (Bulgakov 150-151)

Bulgakov points out the importance of the compliance of the actor with particular appearance requirements of the character, as well as the inherent talent of the actor. Bulgakov was convinced that no rehearsals are able to turn a bad actor's play into a better one:

> I started to think simply: if the theory of Ivan Vasilievich [the director] is flawless and through his exercises the actor can learn the talent of transformation, then it will naturally follow that in every play, every actor will be able to give a complete illusion to the viewer. And will play the way that the viewer forgets that there is stage in front of him... (my translation) (Bulgakov 180)

Teatral'ny Roman describes Bulgakov's experience working for the Moscow Art Theatre (MKhAT; Russian: MXAT). Bulgakov wrote and staged several plays for the Theatre. However, after *Heart of a Dog* (written in 1925), his plays were gradually banned in the theatres across the country. In 1930 with no income, and highly depressed, Bulgakov wrote a letter to Stalin asking to allow him to emigrate. He got a call from Stalin and was appointed an assistant producer with the Moscow Art Theatre. However his works remained unpublished and most of his plays were not staged.

Vasily Novikov writes that according to Stanislavski, Bulgakov had an inherent sense of the stage and that he intuitively felt the inner dramatic force of the word. Bulgakov was convinced that a word in a mise-en-scène carries a lot more energy than in prose, as it exposes both the personality of the character, as well as changes the plot. Most importantly, it develops the collision, as it contains energy that determines the dramatic force of the work as a whole picture, as a piece of life giving a realistic impression of the past or present (Novikov). However it is crucial not to misinterpret Bulgakov's words about the importance of the word in adaptation of the text into a different medium. What Bulgakov saw as essential for the adaptation of the literary text is the creation of complex memorable characters, who through word and action convey an important meaning and a particular idea. There should be spontaneity involved, which presents the idea that Bulgakov was a supporter of the "intertextual" rather than "autotextual" approach to his literary works' adaptation. According to Novikov, in his letter to the Soviet writer Vikenty Veresaev, Bulgakov explains his view on adaptation in a nutshell: what was important for him is the combination of the factors – the relative faithfulness of the story, the natural exposure of the character's personality, the conflict arising from it, and the dramatic force of the word. According to Bulgakov, there should be interpretation, and it is the job of the viewer to unravel the mysteries (Novikov). So, Bulgakov as a playwright has already given the guidelines for the future adapters of his works to follow. The combination of the factors he enumerated gives an adaptation the necessary dynamism and suspense every viewer is looking for. It would have been a good

strategy if Bortko as well as other directors daring to adapt *The Master and Margarita* into a different medium could be susceptive to them and could employ them into their work.

The Master and Margarita TV Series: "Ideotextual" Adaptation

Any adaptation represents a look at the epoch from the contemporary standpoint, from the time where a different discourse and different power formations are reigning. With time, the reading of a particular text changes. Pavis calls this inevitable process "concretization". The text is said to be "the result of historically determined process of concretization: signifier (literary work as thing), signified (aesthetic object) and Social Context (shorthand) … the "total context of social phenomena, science, philosophy, religion, politics, economics, etc. of the given milieu" (Pavis 27). This explains why we see different adaptations. Adaptation being a "renewed concretization" of the text is therefore connected with the change in context. Depending on a concrete Social Context, the text is placed in a particular situation. This allows one to analyze the text differently depending on the Social Context. However, one should keep in mind that a newly immerged cinematic or theatrical text is not only the result of a new Social Context, but it depends even more on the individual reading and interpretation (Pavis 30).

In an attempt to understand what ideology applies to the cinematic text under analysis and how ideological it is, it is important to look at the discourses and ideological structures prevalent in society at the time the text was created.

This allows one to see the cinematic text as a tool capable of "deciphering as much as reflecting historical reality" (Pavis 35).

Since Putin's rise to power, the question of the restoration of national identity and dignity has been one of the most acute. Therefore, the canonization of *The Master and Margarita* as a classic and, later on, its filmic adaptation had an apparent ideological implication. Most of the recent adaptations of literature have been aired on state-owned Channel One (*Pervy Kanal*; Russian: *Первый Канал*) or Channel *Rossiya* (*Telekanal Rossiya*; Russian: *Телеканал «Россия»*). Both channels reach around 98.5% of the population of the Russian Federation, as well as former republics of the Soviet Union ("Rossiya-1"). From the figures above it became obvious that these two channels are a powerful tool in conveying ideology in such an authoritarian state as contemporary Russia. The choice of the Channel (*Telekanal Rossiya*) is important to mention since it broadcasts only censor approved and government-sponsored projects, which *The Master and Margarita* definitely is.

The next step in the analysis of this particular adaptation and its ideological underpinnings is taking a look into its national, cultural, and historic setting. As Linda Hutcheon notes, "[a]n adaptation, like the work it adapts, is always framed in a context – a time and a place, a society and a culture; it does not exist in a vacuum" (Hutcheon 142).

The setting of Moscow in Bulgakov's novel provides a vivid example of the overall social and political situation in the country in the 1930s. The atmosphere in society is rendered in the opening of the novel:

> There was an oddness about that terrible day in May which is worth recording: … there was not a person to be seen. … no one had come out for a walk under the limes, no one was sitting on a bench, the avenue was empty (Bulgakov 3-4).

Nothing happens in the large public place, Patriarch Ponds, hinting on the stifling atmosphere of silence and social disintegration in society.

One of the most memorable moments in the novel is the Black Magic Show in the Variety Theater. In this theater scene, Woland (the Devil) observes the audience and comments on the unchanged character of Moscow citizens. "[H]ave the city folk changed inwardly?" (123). The reader finds the answer almost immediately through the rain of banknotes produced by Woland's retinue:

> Hundreds of arms were raised, the spectators held the bills up to the lighted stage and saw the most true and honest-to-God watermarks. … The word 'money, money!' hummed everywhere, there were gasps of 'ah, ah!' and merry laughter (Bulgakov 124-125).

Corruption, bribery, self-interest, and greed are, according to Bulgakov, the Muscovites' new god. Materialism is what has real power in society, contrary to the official Soviet ideology, proclaiming the creation of a new "Soviet Man". Andrei Fokich Sokov, a barman from the Variety Theatre speculated in trading food that was already off, which outraged Woland:

> "My precious man! Feta cheese is never green in color … Yes, and the tea? It's simply swill!" (Bulgakov 205)

Koroviev (a member of Woland's retinue) speaks of Stepa Likhodeev, director of the Variety Theatre and Berlioz's roommate, in the plural, to show the lifestyle of the officialdom in general, its corruption and inefficiency: "Generally, theirself

has been up to some terrible swinishness lately. Drinking, using their position to have liaisons with women, don't do devil a thing, and can't do anything, because they don't know anything of what they are supposed to do. Pulling the wool over their superiors' eyes" (Bulgakov 83-84). It is interesting that Bulgakov uses the form of third person plural pronoun "theirself" instead of third person singular "he" when talking about Likhodeev. Even more interesting is the fact that Koroviev does not address Likhodeev directly, choosing to talk about him in third person in his presence. This is extremely significant. In Russian to demonstrate hostile attitude instead of addressing a person directly, s/he is talked about using third person plural pronoun "they" [они]. The choice of the pronoun is also explained by Bulgakov's intention to underline the significant divide in society between the rank-and-file people – "we" [мы] and those in power – "they" [они]. Bulgakov's mockery is intensified by the form of the pronoun "they" [они] often used in the 19th century to talk respectfully about "one's betters". In this context Likhodeev's personality and behavior are juxtaposed to the way he is addressed.

Thus, Bulgakov's depiction of Moscow of the 1930's implies that Soviet state failed at creating a new formation – the New Soviet Man. It failed despite enslavement of the arts by the Communist Party. As Friedberg claims in his article, the idea of liquidating the "old "bourgeois" vices and values" has proved to be unrealistic" (2). It is apparent that "not selfless labor enthusiasm and not concern for collective will over individual desires" (7). The Master's tragedy is the tragedy of a talented creator whose views do not fit into the ideological doctrine of the state, and, therefore, should be eliminated. He lives in the world

where MASSOLIT (Moscow Association of Writers) is in charge of all the literature produced and is an umbrella organization for all artists and writers. The only proof one is a writer is a membership card, the fact which of course mocked by Bulgakov:

> "So, then, to convince yourself that Dostoevsky was a writer, do you have to ask for his identification card? Just take any five pages from one of his novels and you'll be convinced, without any identification card, that you are dealing with a writer" (353).

Bulgakov shows the monopoly of the Union of Soviet Writers, where any writer not fitting the Socialist Realist doctrine, was deprived of any alternatives to be published, as "the original editor's demands were not a reflection of his subjective tastes, but of political directives from above" (Friedberg 2).

Through the satirical depiction of literary life, Bulgakov shows "the wage gap and the privileges of … "new class" of party officials and state functionaries, law-abiding artists and scientists on the one hand, and the masses on the other hand" that only widened under Stalin" (*Master & Margarita*). The complexity of the political environment of Bulgakov's times as well as of contemporary Russia allows us to assume that the *ideotextual* adaptation (focusing not on the text but rather on the political, social and psychological context" (Pavis 38) of many scenes of the novel might be very probable. A close analysis of particular scenes will help us prove this point.

In Chapter 10 of the novel in an attempt to find out where the foreign artist (Woland) is staying, Varenukha, sitting in Rimsky's office, calls the Foreign Tourist Office and finds out that Woland was staying in Likhodeev's apartment, who himself is allegedly now in Yalta. Immediately after that, the viewer sees

NKVD officers coming to Berlioz' and Likhodeev's apartment. They are dressed in uniform and are very law-abiding. Having found nobody in the apartment, they never touch the sealed door of Berlioz's half of the flat. They follow the same rules as an ordinary Soviet citizen would have followed, suggesting a very positive image of the NKVD officer. NKVD had unlimited power, having to report only to Stalin. The NKVD was the most powerful and the most feared institution under Stalin. Any political dissent was to be immediately eliminated by the NKVD. It was infamous for murders and assassinations. Contrary to the fear tinged by NKVD that Bulgakov depicted in his novel, Bortko portrays NKVD officers as regular police officers, dressed in uniform (never the case with NKVD) and acting in accordance with the law. Bortko downplays the political criticism that is central to Bulgakov's novel. According to Brassard, Bortko does so to prevent the viewer from drawing parallels between Stalin's totalitarian and the present-day Putin's authoritarian regimes, hence the positive image of the dreaded secret police (Brassard 154).

The critique of the Soviet regime is largely eliminated from the TV series, which is evident by the absence of any depiction of a very important chapter in the novel entitled *The Dream of Nikanor Ivanovich*. When the novel was first published in 1966 the name of the chapter was just *Nikanor Ivanovich* since most of it was censored, because it contains much pointed criticism of the regime ("Nikanor Ivanovich's Dream"). The Chapter starts with the description of Nikanor Ivanovich's interrogation and which is followed by his appearance in Stravinsky's clinic.

The interrogation scene is written in the indefinite passive form or third person plural form: “a conversation was held with Nikanor Ivanovich” (Russian: “с Никанором Ивановичем вступили в разговор”), “they asked soulfully” (Russian: “задушевно спросили”), “the voice at the desk was … raised” (Russian: “за столом уже повысили голос”), “They did, of course, go to Sadovaya” (Russian: “На Садовую,конечно, съездили”) (Bulgakov 159-160). This is done to again emphasize the role of the secret police (NKVD) and how much it was feared in society. Even though no direct description about the violence is given, it is inferred from the tone of the interrogators’ voice how powerful they are.

It is important to note that this scene is followed by Nikanor Ivanovich’s dream in Stravinsky’s house. The dream depicts the actions of the NKVD secret police in society:

> Then he found himself for some reason in a theatre house, where crystal chandeliers blazed under a gilded ceiling … Everything was as it ought to be in a small-sized but very costly theatre (Bulgakov 161).

This is an obvious allusion to the staged trials of the 1930s. The depiction of the interior in the room is similar to the infamous footage of the show trial of Nikolaj Bukharin in 1938 (“Footage from infamous Moscow show trial”). The audience is sitting in an expansive room with chandeliers. The audience present in the trial is all-male. The tone of the interrogation, as well as the absurd allegations, seems to very much resemble what Bulgakov describes in the following scene. The further description of the audience “an all-male one” brings the satirical tone even further. Hinting at the scene of such a trial, as in a regular theatre people are not

segregated according to sex, Bulgakov is emphasizing the scale of the purges Stalin regime has taken on. Moreover this assumption is proved by the following dialog from the novel:

> 'All sitting?' (Russian: - Сидите?)
> 'Sitting, sitting.' (Russian: - Сидим, сидим.)
> (Bulgakov 161).

This is where Bulgakov uses his famous word play. In Russian the verb "to sit" (Russian: сидеть) has an all well-known connotation of serving a sentence in prison.

The action of the chapter is focused on the whole performance intended to make the participants hand in foreign currency. Supposedly it is a reference to the 1929 NKVD campaign to extract foreign currency, gold, and jewels. According to the archival data, *foreign currency speculators* were imprisoned and were made to hand in currency through a variety if violent methods, such as "feeding them salty food and no water" ("Nikanor Ivanovich's Dream"). From the details of the scene, we can assume that Bulgakov was alluding to 1930's show trials.

Bortko had definitely known that the Chapter had been censored for political reasons. This fact alone emphasizes its importance of the Chapter to the work of Bulgakov and to the reader. However, it seems like Bortko was following the ideological path of downplaying the critique of the Soviet regime and its institutions. Thus the faithful portrayal of the life conditions of the Soviet times is undermined by Bortko's own political and ideological views. In my opinion his ideological contextualization of the novel, its censoring is in line with the present day Russia's ideology, which is against any kind of opposition and democratic

thought. The terror of the Soviet citizens and the falsified accusations and oppression so vividly depicted in Chapter 15 and so crucial to understanding the Soviet reality and its consequences, is absent altogether in Bortko's presentation. This significantly changes the reading of the novel making it ideological. Even though Chapter 15 *Nikanor Ivanovich's Dream* is missing in the adaptation, I would nonetheless call its absence an ideotextual mise-en-scène.

It seems logical that Bortko is downplaying the political satire in *The Master and Margarita* TV series, understating the horrors of the regime and people's everyday fear. I see his interpretation to be connected with his personal and political views. Bortko sees Stalinist times as a booming time. He sees it as a time of astounding growth in industry, as a golden age of Soviet literature and art, including cinema. He does admit the economic flaws and fails, but dismisses the suffocating politics and any implications at Stalin's tyranny. In his interviews Bortko expresses deep respect towards the times, and reverential attitude towards Stalin. He emphasizes that this epoch was marked by zero corruption, best education in the world and "friendship of peoples". Bortko is adamant that the destruction of Stalin's cult of personality with the revelation of his actions during his rule had a negative affect on Russian people's values' system. Refusing to admit any accusation of Stalin's cruelty, Bortko states: "It's not the matter of [Stalin's] cruelty. Peter [the Great], by the way, was far more cruel than Stalin. It is just that Stalin had an understanding of what needs to be done and how to entirely solve the problem." Bortko's positive attitude towards Stalin as well as the epoch is best reflected in his coming project of filming a movie about Stalin as

a national hero ("Vladimir Vladimirovich Bortko", my translation). So Bortko's political and personal views seem to be at the core of his cinematographic point of view in the adaptation of *The Master and Margarita* and its ideological connotation.

Black Magic and Its Exposure

Bakhtin asserts that the carnival served as a form of liberation and empowerment for the lower classes. In his work *Rabelais and His World* (Russian: *Рабле и его Мир* (1969)) Bakhtin shows how through carnival people were set free from the dogma of the Catholic Church, and all class distinctions were temporarily abolished. What is even more important, fear of the power and accusations was suspended as well. In *The Master and Margarita*, the most strange and memorable events are carnivalesque, and as Arnold points out "they mock and challenge the Soviet authorities" (Arnold 1-2). The liberating power reveals itself in setting the Soviet citizens free from the censorship and restrictions of the Soviet ideology for the time of the carnival. According to Arnold, the carnivalesque show created by Woland, Koroviev, and Behemoth at the Variety Theatre is "an attempt to bring the "undesirable" private "truths" about "Soviet people" from under the ideological "blanket" and into the light of public attention" (Arnold 2). It is the way to reveal the bankruptcy of the Soviet ideology through laughter, to eliminate fear of authority in people's minds. The power of the carnival is seen in the bureaucrats being removed from their positions: Berlioz, Nikanor Ivanovich, Prolezhnev, Likhodeev, Rimsky, Varenukha. The

carnivalesque nature of Berlioz's death, Nikanor Ivanovich's talk to Koroviev, followed by the arrest and interrogation, Likhodeev's miraculous disappearance from Moscow and arrival in Yalta, Varenukha's transformation in a vampire and his attempt to kill Rimsky,- all support Bakhtin's theory.

At the Black Magic Show at the Variety Theatre, the performance begins with Woland, Koroviev and Behemoth appearing on stage and talking about the unchanged nature of the Muscovites: "[H]ave the city folk changed inwardly?'(Bulgakov 123) Money begins to fall down from the ceiling as soon as Koroviev shoots the gun up. The audience creates havoc trying to grab as many bills as possible:

> The word 'money, money!' hummed everywhere, there were gasps of 'ah, ah!' and merry laughter. One or two were crawling in the aisles, feeling under the chair. Many stood on the seats, trying to catch the flighty, capricious notes (Bulgakov 124-125).

The compere George Bengalsky asks Woland to reveal the magic and make the notes disappear. The idea is not supported by the audience. Nor do they laugh at Bengalsky's trite jokes anymore. They prefer Koroviev's and Behemoth's "slapstick" humor. When the audience laughs at Koroviev's and Behemoth's jokes and completely ignores Bengalsky, they probably laugh at the official authorities and thus liberate themselves from its dogma (Arnold 5-6).

This scene is emblematic of the society's transformation during the carnival. The Soviet citizens do not want to subordinate to the official (Bengalsky's) discourse and prefer Koroviev and Behemoth's one instead. Somebody in the audience suggested Bengalsky's decapitation: "Growling, the cat sank his plump paws into the skimpy chevelure of the master of ceremonies

and in two twists tore his head from the thick neck with a savage howl (Bulgakov 126). The audience was in awe; it sympathizes with Bengalsky and asks the cat to put the head back, which the cat does. Woland's reply to it is the following:

> 'They are people like any other people… They love money but that has always been so … Well, they're light—minded … well, what of it ... mercy sometimes knocks at their hearts … ordinary people… In general, reminiscent of the former ones… only the housing problem has corrupted them…'' (Bulgakov 126).

As Arnold notices, as a literary device carnival in *The Master and Margarita,* "draws the attention of readers to the actions, words, and thoughts of the Muscovites". It helps to understand the Muscovites as a community. But what is even more important, is that the atmosphere of carnival and liberation helps the Muscovites overcome their mistrust towards each other, express subversive opinions as well as express compassion as the whole community (Arnold 6).

Koroviev's next trick is the display of the ladies' salon: clothes and accessories from Paris. Koroviev offers the women in the audience to exchange their outfits for free for the Parisian dresses and accessories. This is a great temptation for the audience, especially taking into account the time when it was happening – Moscow of the 1930's, when there was *defitsit* in the supply of the essentials, to say nothing about imported goods. For some time the audience is silent, and after a while one single woman gets transformed in the salon. Immediately all the women in the audience rush to the stage to get the same:

> [F]rom all sides women marched on to the stage. … Women disappeared behind the curtain, leaving their dresses there and coming out in new ones. … Then Faggot announced that owing to the lateness of the hour, the shop would close in exactly one minute until the next evening, and an unbelievable scramble arouse on-stage. Women hastily grabbed shoes without trying them on (Bulgakov 129).

Through this scene one can see again that the Soviet people are reunited. They are reunited through the acceptance of the same sins that dominate in society, - greed, material possessions. They accept others with their "sinful" identity, which shows them as being able to develop a different from the official ideology's point of view. The scene proves to Woland and the Muscovites that all people are exposed to the same temptations, regardless of their Socialist Realist imposed identity (Arnold 9).

Another interesting aspect adding to the carnivalesque spirit of the show is the episode with the Chairman of the Acoustics Commission of the Moscow Theatres, Sempleyarov. Sempleyarov calls out to expose the magic. However Bulgakov, through Woland, changes the whole meaning of it through the word play. Koroviev did the exposure indeed, but not of the black magic. Sempleyarov's affair with the "actress from the local repertory theatre" is revealed (152). Sempleyarov is laughed at by the audience, thus ridiculing his improper behavior and double-standard life-style. Woland does the revelation through the "carnivalesque abuse" and exposure of the vices of the Muscovites, rather than the Black Magic (Arnold 11).

After the magnificent show is over, the viewers of the show find themselves in the streets of Moscow wearing nothing, since the exchanged clothes they got during the show disappear:

> In the bright light of the strongest street lights [Rimsky] saw, just below him on the sidewalk, a lady in nothing but a shift and violet bloomers. True, there was a little hat on the lady's head and an umbrella in her hands (151).

The obsession of the Muscovites with commodities leads to their disappearance. This is probably meant to teach them a lesson – to show the emptiness of their lives based on the material possessions. The bills distributed at the magic show also turn into cut paper or bottle wraps afterwards. This scene is very entertaining for the reader, very carnivalesque, but at the same time it renders a very important social connotation. Through its carnivalesque form Bulgakov manages to show the inner face of the community, as at some point people start speaking and behaving freely, being released from the constraints of the authorities. As the Soviet society is highly prescriptive, carnival is the only opportunity for people "to transcend the ideological cocoon created by the monologic authoritarian discourse and connect to the variety of views present in the community, thus moving towards a more dialogic self" (Arnold 4).

Bortko's adaptation keeps all the actions and the dialogues of the "Variety Theatre" sequence unchanged. All the dialogues are preserved and rendered autotextually. At first we see Woland and his retinue talking about the unchanged character of the Muscovites, followed by the tricks with cards, done by Koroviev and Behemoth. The performance with Bengalsky's decapitation is also present in its unchanged dialog form in the adaptation. Then the viewers see one of the key scenes of the sequence: the trick of ten-ruble notes falling from the ceiling, and the madness it creates. The revelation procedure, with the exposure of Sempleyarov's love affair is also rendered almost unchanged. Through the autotextual representation of the scene Bortko demonstrates fidelity to Bulgakov's text. However, in my opinion, a lot of the carnivalesque character and atmosphere

of the scene is not communicated. Maybe these are the costs of transforming the work from one medium to another. However, the idea of the carnival unification of people and their liberation from the dogma of the official authorities is not apparent in the cinematic version.

What is foregrounded in Bortko's adaptation is the critique of the Soviet economy with its deficits and shortages. That is why the scene with the women's salon is made one of the most memorable scenes in the sequence. This scene is followed by the money transformed into cut paper or bottle labels, which is the reason why the barman Andrei Fokich Sokov comes to Woland's apartment in the hopes of getting his money back. However Woland replies by pointing out to the inappropriate food supply in the Variety Theater:

> 'I,' the barman began bitterly, 'am the manager of the buffet at the Variety Theatre …'
> 'No, no, no! Not a word more! Never and by no means! Nothing from your buffet will ever pass my lips! I, my esteemed sir, walked past your stand yesterday, and even now I am unable to forget either the sturgeon or the feta cheese! My precious man! Feta cheese is never green in color, someone has tricked you ….'
> 'They supplied sturgeon of the second freshness,' the barman said. …
> 'Second freshness – that's what is nonsense! There is only one freshness – the first – and it's also the last. And if sturgeon is of second freshness, that means it's simply rotten.' (Bulgakov 205)

This scene is emblematic of the real economic situation in the country in the 1930's. As Jeffrey Brassard writes, Bortko (born in 1946) is not nostalgic about the Soviet times, in contrast to many people of his generation (Brassard156). It is the under Putin's regime that Bortko acquires most of his fame and wealth due to state orders, state grants and state subsidies. The attack on the Soviet economic arrangement is therefore quite grounded, as the system failed to support a decent

lifestyle for its ordinary citizens. To camouflage the problem instead of sorting it out the government resorted to double-standards that are vividly portrayed in the scene with the barman Sokov, as it demonstrates false, pretentious and empty Soviet discourse, that was supposed to distract people from reality (Brassard 156).

Demonstrating fidelity to Bulgakov's text, Bortko keeps the dialog unchanged, considering it significant for the viewer's understanding of the situation in the country. However, presented just in the form of a dialogue with no action taking place, the scene appears tedious and dull. Rendered word for word, the sequence with the Black Magic and Its Exposure could have fallen into the category of autotextual representation, if not for its ideological connotation. In addition to showing the downside of Soviet economic situation, Bortko seems to deliberately accentuate it in order for the reader to compare it to the present-day situation. He wants the viewer to get "a sense of pride and accomplishment … for having survived material deprivation, while simultaneously reminding them of the current rise in living standards" (Brassard 156). The detailed depiction of the scene serves complementary of Putin's regime and the state of economy under him. Thus this sequence can be categorized as ideotextual.

The *Torgsin* Scene

> [A]pproximately a quarter of an hour after the fire started on Sadovaya, there appeared by the mirrored doors of a currency store on the Smolensky market-place a long citizen in a checkered suit, and with him a big black cat (Bulgakov 347).

This is the beginning of the Chapter called *The Last Adventures of Koroviev and Behemoth*. The episode is a carnivalesque mockery at the treatment of the

government of its own people. It reveals the real attitude and the inner protest of the Soviet citizens.

The abbreviation *Torgsin* stands for *Торговля с Иностранцами* (English: *Trade with Foreigners*). This was a typical store for the time period, where for foreign currency one could purchase otherwise impossible to obtain clothes and food. There were security men at the entrance who did not let in those who did not look like they possess foreign currency (*Torgsin*). The stores like *Torgsin* were organized for a particular reason: to extract as much foreign currency as possible from those who had it.

The organization of Torgsins as such was a mockery of the ordinary Soviet citizen, especially in a society "ostensibly dedicated to abolition of inequality" (Friedberg 8). There was famine and shortage in the country in 1930's, but the government wanted the citizens to be distracted from this, and rather focus on the illusion they have created for them.

Koroviev and Behemoth come to Torgsin and create havoc there. Behemoth starts to nonchalantly gobble tangerines, destroy chocolate structures and "swallow the chocolate complete with its gold wrapper", [and he] devoured herrings (394). When there is protest and threats from the management of the store, Kotroviev resorts to a clever trick of appealing to everyone's true feelings:

> 'Citizens!' he called out in a high vibrating voice, 'what's going on here? Eh? Allow me to ask you that! The poor man' – Koroviev let some tremor into his voice and pointed to Behemoth, who had immediately concocted a woeful physiognomy – 'the poor man spends all day repairing primuses. He got hungry … and where is he going to get currency?' (Bulgakov 350).

This speech is followed by the grotesque description of the citizens' support.

> A most decent, quiet little old man, poorly but cleanly dressed, a little old man buying three macaroons in the confectionary department, was suddenly transformed. His eyes flashed with bellicose fire, he turned purple, hurled the little bad of macaroons on the floor, and shouted 'True!' in a child's high voice. Then he snatched up a tray, throwing from it the remains of the chocolate Eiffel Tower demolished by Behemoth, brandished it, tore the foreigner's hat off with his left hand, and with his right swung and struck the foreigner flat on his bald head with the tray (Bulgakov 351).

The carnivalesque havoc wreaked by Koroviev and Behemoth reminds the Soviet citizens of the real state of things in the Soviet society. It would be wrong to say that everyone was blind to inequality. After all, Soviet people continued to read classics as well as translated Western literature, which definitely "contributed to further sensitizing … to social injustice" (Friedberg 8). The carnival opens up sympathy in the citizens towards each other and provokes protest towards the unjust organization of society. The citizens are unified and set free to express their dissatisfaction regardless of the fear reigning in the Soviet society.

The economic inequality, prevailing in society is well portrayed in Bortko's adaptation. Koroviev and Behemoth's arrival, and their hardships getting into the store, and the support of the fellow-citizens are all well-rendered through the cinematic version. Bortko succeeded in rendering Bulgakov' main idea - to show a huge economic segregation in the society where the official ideology claimed everybody is equal.

As Brassard notes, Bortko very effectively shows Soviet people with hopeless faces, standing in front of the store, not allowed to get in. The camera moves along the store's shop window, demonstrating the exclusive goods available to the lucky ones, obtaining foreign currency. Inside the store the

camera concentrates on the chic interior of the store, that is, again very contrastive to the poorly designed Soviet stores of the time. To emphasize the poverty of Soviet society Bortko shows a little girl begging her Mom to buy candy, but is immediately told that they have to go because they do not have the money. Another scene shows an old gentleman buying one tangerine, as this is an exclusive and therefore expensive article. By rendering the dialogues of the characters word for word and demonstrating the overall support of the havoc created by Fagot and Behemoth in the store, Bortko communicates Bulgakov's message about the failure of the economic system and people's dissatisfaction with it as opposed to the official ideology of happy and abundant lifestyle of Soviet citizens (Brassard 157).

The scene also expresses Bortko's personal take on the portrayal of the situation. As pointed out by Brassard, a vivid and detailed portrayal of economic hardships in the Soviet times again gives the viewers in Putin's Russia a good feeling about the life style they managed to have with the ruling power, where the abundance available only in Torgsin can easily be obtained by an ordinary citizen now (157). It also plays on the contrast between the Putin's and Yeltsin's eras. Thus the generation born in the 80's will more probably contrast these two periods to the advantage of the former. The early 1990s was the time of overall national depression and deficit, since due to Yeltsin's reforms the prices for essential goods rose dramatically, "[b]read lines disappeared, but bread prices climbed higher than wages", wage payments to workers and retires were withheld. Average Russian families suffered from the food shortage (Desai 96).

The sense of achievement, as well as the ideas of the much better standards of living, are the messages clearly identified through Bortko's cinematic representation (Brassard 157). This again hints at the deep ideological connotation of the scene and puts it into the category of ideotextual representation.

The ideotextual representation in both of the scenes I have described, *Black Magic and Its Exposure* Show and the Torgsin scene from *The Last Adventures of Koroviev and Behemoth*, demonstrates the economic situation critique. However the important political criticism so apparent in Bulgakov's novel is left missing for the most part. This is supportive of the idea that Bortko aims to depict the downside of the Soviet economic organization. The political criticism apparent in Bulgakov's novel is absent in Bortko's adaptation for particular reasons. As Brassard points out, Bortko does not want the viewer to draw parallels between the totalitarian regime under Stalin and the authoritarian regime under Putin. This is even more evident considering the generous money support the TV-series received. The TV-series was intended to not only familiarize the younger audience with the great work of literature, or to give the pleasure of another encounter with the favorite Bulgakov's characters to the older generation, but also for the feeling of satisfaction with the present-day life standards created by the ruling power (Brassard 152). Unfortunately, those who have not read the novel may take Bortko's interpretation at face value, remaining unfamiliar with satire so important to Bulgakov's text.

The above analysis proves the scenes under discussion as ideotextual since it is apparent that "the political, social and psychological subtext" is

foregrounded. The ideotextual type of adaptation still remains popular, especially (but not only) in the countries with a less democratic political regime. As Patrice Pavis states, different adaptations produced at different moments in history provide a different reading of a particular text. Even though the text remains the same, the changes consider its spirit that can be modified and reconstructed (27). The ideotextual mise-en-scènes connected to pro-Putin connotations in *The Master and Margarita* TV series is a conclusive proof to it.

A look into the adaptation as a popular tendency helped to better understand the general reasons for its popularity in contemporary Russia.

The study of the link between translation and adaptation sheds light on the problematic of adaptation, specifically on the issue of fidelity to the original text. The analysis of "autotextual" and "intertextual" mise-en-scènes in *The Master and Margarita*, has demonstrated the way the director adjusted the original text to a different medium. The analysis of "ideotextual" mise-en-scènes has shown how the political implications of the TV mini series changed the original message of the novel.

Pavis writes that the reading of the text will always depend on the historical context, as any text is "a historically determined process of concretization" (27). As Pavis points out, "[t]he letter of the text … remains of course unchanged, but the spirit varies considerably" (27). Therefore, it is important to keep in mind that every adaptation can only be treated as interpretation, as the reading of the text will change with a change of epochs and rulers.

Conclusion

> So, then, to convince yourself that Dostoevsky was a writer, do you have to ask for his identification card? Just take any five pages from one of his novels and you'll be convinced, without any identification card, that you are dealing with a writer.
>
> --Bulgakov, *The Master and Margarita*

Mikhail Bulgakov's finest work, *The Master and Margarita*, was never published in his lifetime for political and ideological reasons. It was first published in 1966 but in a censored edition. The first translations were done from the censored editions as well. The unabridged version became available for the Russian audience only in 1989. A number of translations multiplied after the 1990's, as well as the number of film adaptations, drawing even more attention to the "cult" novel. Both the number of existing and newly emerging translations of the novel as well as the overall agitation about its adaptations into film prompted this research.

Through a closer look into the history of creation of the novel in Chapter One, this thesis investigates the reasons for the novel's complexity on both semantic and textological levels. This Chapter gives a brief chronicle of Bulgakov's life, providing a brief overview of Bulgakov's personality and hardships of the writer in the Soviet era, which all affected his writing. Situating the novel historically, as well as reading critical works and looking into the personalities of translators, the Chapter follows Anthony Pym's method on "who translated what, how, where, when, and with what effect" (Pym 5). Thus, Chapter I demonstrated both the complexity of the literary work as well as the reasons for the existence of many translations.

Chapter Two provides the analysis of the most popular translations of the novel, those by Mikhail Glenny, Mirra Ginsburg, Diana Burgin and Katherine O'Connor and Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky. It reveals the textological complexities of the novel and the ways the translators tackled them. Chapter II incorporates a theoretical framework by Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet, Eugene Nida, Antoine Berman and others, providing a foundation for the analysis of individual translations. Through the comparative analysis of the four translations the Chapter demonstrates the challenges encountered by the translators and the techniques the translators employed to overcome them. The Chapter also provides a critical assessment of the ways Bulgakov's messages were communicated in the English translations. The analysis presents more proof of the existence of textological issues of the original text and the problematics of its translation. The translation of the proper name *Бездомный* (my italics), the last name of one of the characters, is representative of the problematics of translation. As already mentioned in Chapter II, there is an accepted practice in translation to transliterate last names in compliance with a foreignizing principle. However, the last name is translated (as *Homeless*) both in the earlier translation by Ginsburg as well as in one of the latest translations by Pevear and Volokhonsky. The question of "fidelity" being the focus of translation field for many years concerns not only the interlingual translation.

Through close reading and the comparative analysis of *The Master and Margarita* and its adaptation into the TV mini series, Chapter Three explores the techniques the director applied to render the author's messages and how

successful it was. The Chapter demonstrates the approach to adaptation as interpretation, following Robert Stam's viewpoint. Employing Patrice Pavis' methodology, the Chapter categorizes the scenes into "autotextual", "intertextual" and "ideotextual" mise-en-scènes, exploring what changes (if any) the original message undergoes in each category and "opening up the text to several possible interpretations" (Pavis 30). A general look into the historical context and the political situation in contemporary Russia, as well as the personality of the director, allows to understand other factors that affect the adaptation under scrutiny. After all, according to Pavis, it is not only the historical changes, that affect any adaptation. It is "a result of the individual readings of the same text by different people" (Pavis 30).

I hope this thesis will help both emphasize the importance of looking into the history of creation of the literary work and to consider a number of factors that all come into play when understanding particular translation choices. This thesis also stresses the importance of a figure of translator through both a general overview of their personality as well as through examining their translation practices. It is only recently that the translator has been recognized as the one playing an important role in creating a "new" literary work, in communicating the important messages of the author. It is important to remember that it is not only the translator's ability, but also their personal approach to translation and their personality that all have an affect on their work.

I believe my work will also help to understand the popularity of adaptation as a major trend, specifically in contemporary Russia. It examines the underlying

historical and political reasons for newly emerging adaptations on Russian TV. In the epoch of Putin, adaptation has acquired a new meaning in Russian society. As David MacFadyen so accurately notes, "The most important and popular stories in Russia have traditionally been those of literature; that function is currently being fulfilled by TV drama (1)." Television shows on Russian TV often based on the grand narrative, present a retrospective view of the past, while simultaneously creating a new one on the future. Stories help an average viewer to make sense of the past and answer the nation's eternal questions "What happened to us? And "Why" (MacFadyen 1). An adaptation has become one of the newly rediscovered means of learning about the history of the country. As Friedberg notices in his article "[t]he country's past is regarded as a way of explaining Russia's idiosyncratic national destiny … and also of what is perceived as Russian national character (Friedberg 13)."

It is my hope that my work will help to further develop a significantly broader view on translation and adaptation, opening up a variety of ways for their investigation and analysis, presenting challenges as a means of inspiration for future researchers. As was mentioned earlier, in the epoch of Putin, adaptations have become a popular trend. Apart from *The Master and Margarita* there is a whole range of recent adaptations, such as: *The Idiot (2003), Doctor Zhivago (2005), The First Circle (V Kruge pervom) (2005), The Golden Calf (Zolotoi Telenok) (2005), Esenin (2005), Hero of Our Time (Geroi Nashego Vremeni) (2006), Anna Karenina (2008).* A new epoch demonstrates a significant shift towards a freer approach to adaptation, enabling the director to interpret the text

rather than to render it “autotextually”. As in *The Master and Margarita* adaptation, the director is not only free to interpret the text, but also to employ a number of techniques within one adaptation. This proves Linda Hutcheon’s point that, “[a]n adaptation, like the work it adapts, is always framed in a context – a time and a place, a society and a culture; it does not exist in a vacuum” (Hutcheon 142).

Bibliography

"Addresses to the Federal Assembly." *President of Russia*. N.p., 8 July 2000. Web. 24 Oct. 2012.

Andrew, Dudley. *Concepts in Film Theory*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1984. Print.

Appiah, Kwame Anthoony. "Thick Translation." *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2004, 389-402. Print.

Arnold, Yanina. "Through the Lens of Carnival: Identity, Community, and Fear in Mikhail Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita*." *Toronto Slavic Quarterly (TSQ)* 11 (2005): n. pag. JSTOR. Web. 15 Dec. 2012.

Barratt, Andrew. Between Two Worlds: a Critical Introduction to *The Master and Margarita*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987. Print.

Barskova, Polina. "As If from a Lost Culture: Musings on Vladimir Bortko's *Master and Margarita*" (2005)." *Kinokultura* (2006). Web. 15 Oct. 2012.

Belobrovtseva, Irina, Kuljus Svetlana. *Roman Bulgakova "Master i Margarita."* *Kommentarij*. Moskva: Knizhnyj Klub 36.6, 2007. Print.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of the Translator: an Introduction to the Translation of Baudelaire's Tableaux Parisiens." Trans. Harry Zohn. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2004, 75-83. Print.

Berman, Antoine. “Translation and the Trials of the Foreign.” Trans. Lawrence Venuti. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2004, 276-290. Print.

Brassard, Jeffrey. “Bortko's *The Master and Margarita*: Adaptation in the Service of Vladimir Putin.” *Journal of Popular Film & Television*; 40.3 (2012): 151-158. Print.

“Boulevard.” *Merriam-Webster*. Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online, 2012. Web. 26 Apr. 2012.

Bulgakov, Mikhail. *Black Snow. A Theatrical Novel*. Trans. Michael Glenny. Suffolk: 1971. Print.

Bulgakov, Mikhail Afanas’evich. *Master i Margarita; roman*. Parizh: YMCA-Press, 1968. Print.

---. *The Master and Margarita*. Translated from Russian by Mirra Ginsburg. New York: Grove Press, 1967. Print.

---. *The Master and Margarita* / [by] Mikhail Bulgakov. Translated from Russian by Michael Glenny. New York: Harper & Row, [1967], 1967. Print.

---. *The Master and Margarita*. Translated from Russian by D. Burgin and C. O’Connor. New York: Vintage Books, [1995], 1996. Reprint.

---. *The Master and Margarita*. Translated and with Notes by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky. New York: Penguin Books, 1997. Print.

"Bulgakov: Three Versions of Hell in the Griboyedov Restaurant." *Gypsy Scholar*. Web. 20 Apr. 2012.

Burgin, Diana and Catherine O'Connor. *Translator's Note*. "The Master and Margarita" by Mikhail Bulgako. Translated from Russian by D. Burgin and C. O'Connor. New York: Vintage Books, [1995], 1996. p. vii Reprint.

Catford, J.C. "Translation shifts." *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2004, 140-147. Print.

Chudakova, Marietta. "Zhizneopisanie Mikhaila Bulgakova." *Pisateli o Pisatelyah.* Web. 11 Apr. 2012.

Chukovsky, Korney. "Vokrug Vysokogo Iskusstva." *Jewish Library*. Web. 17 Apr. 2012.

"Chyorny tsvet." *Symbolarium*. Web. 1 Oct. 2012.

Conquest, Robert. *The Great Terror: Stalin's Purge of the Thirties*. Rev. ed. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971. Print.

"Cultural memory." *University of Toronto Library On-line*. Web. 28 Sep. 2012.

Dalaney, Joan. *The Master and Margarita*: The Reach Exceeds the Grasp. *Slavic Review* 31:1 (1972): 89-100. *Erudit*. Web. 18 Feb. 2012.

Desai, Padma. "Russian Retrospectives on Reforms from Yeltsin to Putin." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 19.1 (2005): 87-106. Print.

D'Hulst, Lieven. "Emerging Views on Translation History in Brazil" *CROP: Special issue.* Jianzhong, X., ed. Milton, John. 2001. Perspectives-Copenhagen and Clevedon-Studies in Translatology- ; 2002, 10 (Part 4):312-315. Pub: Denmark, Museum Tusculanum Press, 2002. Print.

"Do not frown upon translator's preface!" *Linguistblog*. Web. 20 Apr. 2012.

Doubivko, Lena. "Good Wine Gets Better With Age." *Kinokultura* 34 (2011). Web. 20 Nov. 2012.

Elliott, Kamilla. *Rethinking the Novel/Film Debate*. Cambridge, United Kingdom; New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Print.

Friedberg, Maurice. "Literary Culture: "New Soviet Man" in the Mirror of Literature." *University of Nevada Library*. Web. 2 Jan. 2013.

Ganieva, Alisa. "Literatura v "Iashchike". Voprosy Literatury (VLit) 4 (2009): 81-88. Print.

Genette, Gerard. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree.* Trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky; Foreword by Gerald Prince. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, c1997; 1982. Print.

Gillespie, David. *Russian Cinema*. Harlow, England; New York: Longman, 2003. Print.

Ginsburg, Mirra. *Translator's Note*. "The Master and Margarita" by Mikhail Bulgakov. Translated from Russian by Mirra Ginsburg. New York: Grove Press, 1967. p. xxi. Print.

Gogol, Nikolai Vasilievich. *Taras Bulba.* The Literature Network . Web. 1 Nov. 2012.

Hirsch, Marianne; Spitzer, Leo. "Vulnerable Lives: Secrets, Noise, Dust." *Profession* 2011; 51-67. *MLA.* Web. 29 Feb. 2012.

Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Adaptation* . New York: Routledge, 2006. Print.

Jones, Polly. "A Symptom of the Times: Assigning Responsibility for the Stalin Cult in the Soviet Literary Community, 1953–64." *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 42.2 (2006): 151-67. Print.

Kaspe, Irina. "Manuscripts Are Kept Forever: Televised Series and Literature." *Russian Studies in Literature* 43.4 (2007): 17-39. Print.

Larson, Peter Georges. "Spaces as means of resistance: Bulgakov and Dostoevsky." Diss. University of Alberta, 2009. Print.

"Lemonade." *Merriam-Webster*. Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online, 2012. Web. 26 Apr. 2012.

"Linguistic Approach to Translation Theory." *Translationdirectory*. Web. 26 Apr. 2012.

MacFadyen, David. *Russian Television Today: Primetime Drama and Comedy.* London; New York: Routledge, 2008. Print.

Makarov, Artur. "Rezhissyor Vladimir Bortko – zhizn' s Idiotom. Teleserial'nym." *Krossvord-kafe*. Pervaya Krymskaya 373. 13/19 May 2011. Web. 29 Sep. 2012.

Malena, Anne. "Where is the "History" in Translation Histories?" Rep. TTR 24.2 (2011) 87-115. Print.

"Master i Margarita - Yuri Kara." *Master & Margarita.* N.p. n.d. Web 12 Sep. 2012.

Master i Margarita. Dir. Vladimir Bortko. Rossiya. DVD.

Master & Margarita . N.p. n.d. Web. 20 Feb. 2012.

May, Rachel. "Three Translations of *The Master and Margarita*." *Translation Review* (TRev) 55 (1998): 29-33. *MLA*. Web. 20 Feb. 2012.

Medvedev, Roy Aleksandrovich. *O Staline i Stalinizme* / Roy Medvedev. Moskva: Progress, 1990. Print.

"Mihail Bulgakov." *Adsmana*. Web. 5 Dec. 2012.

"Mirra Ginsburg." *Jewish Women's Archive*. Web. 20 Apr. 2012.

Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. 2nd ed. London; New York: Routledge, [2010], c2008. Print.

"Narzan." *Merriam-Webster*. Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online , 2012. Web. 26 Apr. 2012.

Nida, Eugene. "Principles of Correspondence." *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. New York : Routledge, 2004, 127-140. Print.

"Nikanor Ivanovich's Dream". *Master & Margarita.* N.p. n.d. Web. 1 Oct. 2012.

Novikov, Vladimir. "Glava 3. Bulgakov – Dramaturg." *Rusofil*. Web. 30 Nov. 2012.

"Oprah's Book Club." Web. 1 Jan. 2012.

"Patriarch's Ponds." *Master & Margarita.* N.p. n.d. Web. 5 Oct. 2012.

Pavis, Patrice. *Theatre at the crossroads of culture* . Trans. Loren Kruger. London; New York: Routledge, 1992. Print.

"Pest." *Merriam-Webster*. Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online, 2012. Web. 26 Apr. 2012.

Pevear, Richard and Larissa Volokhonsky. *Translator's Note*. " The Master and Margarita" by Mikhail Bulgakov. Translated and with Notes by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky. New York: Penguin Books, 1997. p.xxi. Print.

Pierrotsvideo. "Footage from Infamous Moscow Show Trial." Online video clip. *YouTube*. YouTube, 28 June 2009. Web. 1 Dec. 2012.

Proffer, Ellendea. *The Master and Margarita*. Mikhail Bulgakov. Trans. D. Burgin and C. O'Connor. New York: Vintage Books, [1995], 1996. Reprint.

Prokhorov, Alexander. "Brilliantovaia ruka/The Diamond Arm: Leonid Gaidai, USSR, 1969." *The Cinema of Russia and the Former Soviet Union* . Ed. Brigit Beumers, preface Sergei Bodrov. London, England: Wallflower, 2006, 129-137. Print.

Pym, Anthony, *Method in Translation History*, Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing, 1998. Print.

"Revelations from the Russian Archives. ANTI-RELIGIOUS COMPAIGNS." *Library of Congress* . Web. 11 Oct. 2012.

"Rossiya-1." *Wikipedia*. Web. 2 Dec. 2012.

Russia! Magazine. Web. 20 Feb. 2012

"Sadovoye Koltso." *Merriam-Webster*. Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online. Web. 26 Apr. 2012.

Salys, Rimgaila. "Tsirk." *Musical Comedy Films of Grigorii Aleksandrov*. 2009. 121-200. *EBSCO*. Web. 24 Feb. 2012.

St-Pierre, Paul. "Translation as a Discourse of History." TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Redaction: Etudes Sur le Texte et Ses Transformations (TTR) 1993; 6 (1): 61-82. Erudit. Web. 20 Feb. 2012.

"Samizdat." *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Encyclopedia Britannica Online, 2012. Web. 18 Feb. 2012.

Selivanova, Anna. "SMI o Fil'me." *Master i Margarita*. Komsomol'skaya Pravda, n.d. Web. 29. Sep. 2012.

"Seltzer water." *Merriam-Webster*. Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online, 2012. Web. 26 Apr. 2012.

"Serial Master i Margarita." *Vokrug TV*. N.p., n.d. Web. 20 Oct. 2012.

Shlapentokh, Dmitry. "Russian History and the Ideology of Putin's Regime through the Window of Contemporary Russian Movies." *Russian History* vol. 36.2 (2009): 278-301. Print.

Slavyanskaya Evropa. Analiticheskaya gazeta. Web. 10 Nov. 2012.

Smith, Theresa and Thomas Oleszczuk. *No Asylum: State Psychiatric Repression in the Former USSR* / Theresa C. Smith; in Collaboration with Thomas A. Oleszczuk. New York: New York University Press, 1996. Print.

"Solovetsky Monastery, Solovki." *Sacred Destinations.* Web. 28 Apr. 2012.

Stalinism and Soviet cinema . Eds. Richard Taylor and Derek Spring . London; New York: Routledge, 1993. Print.

Stam, Robert and Alessandra Raengo. *Literature and Film: a Guide to the Theory and Practice of Film Adaptation*. Ed. Robert Stam, Alessandra Raengo. Malden, MA: Blackwell; 2005. Print.

Sukhanova, Ekaterina. "'Satanas Ex Machina': Bulgakov's The Master and Margarita in Vladimir Bortko's Cinematic Adaptation." *Slavic and East European Performance* 26.2 (2006): 75-81. Print.

"So you'd like to... Read "The Master and Margarita"." *Amazon*. Web. 22 Apr. 2012

Suny, Ronald Grigor. *The Soviet Experiment: Russia, the USSR, and the Successor States* / Ronald Grigor Suny. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. Print.

"The Alchemy Website." *Levity.* Web. 27 Apr. 2012.

"The Torgsin store." *Master & Margarita.* Web. 10 Nov. 2012.

Venuti, Ed. Lawrence. “Translation, Community, Utopia.” *The Translation Studies Reader s*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2004, 468-488. Print.

Vermeer, Hans J. “Skopos and Commission in Translational Action.” Trans. Andrew Chesterman. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2004, 221-232. Print.

Vinay, Jean-Paul, Darbelnet, Jean. “A Methodology on Translation” Trans. Juan C. Sager and M.-J. Hamel. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2004, 128-138. Print.

“Vladimir Vladimirovich Bortko”. Narodnyj biograficheskij spravochnik BIOGRAFII, MEMUARY, ISTORII. Web. 20 Oct. 2012.

Wagner, Goeffrey. *The Novel and the Cinema*. Rutherford, N. J., Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1975. Print.