

“So You Want to be an Author”: The Yellow Brick Road of Translation, Adaptation, and
Translated Plagiarism

by

Alina Sergachov

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Translation Studies

Department of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies

University of Alberta

Abstract

During the Soviet era, the practice of retelling foreign fiction was relatively common. In 1939, translator Alexander M. Volkov, took the liberty of retelling a well-known Western tale. To be more precise, Volkov changed the title and the names of the characters, omitted and added some chapters, and discarded the name of the author in the process. As a result, generations of readers grew up without knowing that their favorite book was penned by L. Frank Baum and known in the United States as *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. Given that Volkov's version of Baum's tale was published during the Soviet era, there is an overall tendency to relate the discrepancies between *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* and *The Wizard of the Emerald City* to the influence of ideology and censorship, overlooking other potential factors. With the aim of filling the gap, my thesis examines how, and postulates why, Volkov has deviated from the source text. This problem is discussed through a comparison of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* with *The Wizard of the Emerald City* (1959, revised edition). In addition to examining Volkov's modifications using seven categories, this thesis addresses his role in rewriting Baum's tale by attempting to differentiate between translation, adaptation, appropriation, parody and translated plagiarism in general, and, in particular, situate *The Wizard of the Emerald City* within these conceptual categories.

Preface

The first chapter of my thesis, namely “The Problem of Translation, Adaptation and Translated Plagiarism” is based on the final paper written for MLCS 500 course “History of Translation”. This material has also been used during the English Graduate conference at the University College London in 2014.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my supervisor, Irene Sywenky, for keeping up with me and for always finding a time for me in spite of her insanely busy schedule. Without your support I would not have been able to complete this degree a term sooner.

I would also like to thank librarians of the Cameron, Rutherford and Law libraries and tutors of University of Alberta's Centre for Writers. All of you have been there for me when I needed it. Thanks for organising events, such as the Long Night against Procrastination. It is a brilliant idea!

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Chapter I. The Problem of Translation, Adaptation and Translated Plagiarism.....	7
1. Peripheral Position of Children’s Literature in Literary Polysystem.....	9
2. Translation, Adaptation, and Plagiarism: Where to Draw the Line?.....	12
Chapter II. Volkov’s Objectives: The Motivation behind the Transformation of Baum’s Text	
1. Cause-and-Effect Plotting: Goals, Conflicts and Stakes.....	20
2. Foreshadowing.....	27
3. Logical Consistency.....	32
4. Comic Relief.....	41
5. Tone and Mood.....	46
6. Obfuscation of the American Roots.....	58
7. Story Structure and Narrative Focus.....	60
Chapter III. Message of the Story.....	65
1. The Significance of Friendship.....	66
2. Patriotism.....	71
3. Social Critique.....	76
4. Other Interpretations.....	83
Conclusion.....	89
Works Cited.....	94

[T]ranslator's behaviour cannot be expected to be fully systematic. Not only can his/her decision-making be differently motivated in different problem areas, but it can also be unevenly distributed throughout an assignment within a single problem area. Consistency in translational behaviour is thus a *graded* notion which is neither nil (i.e., total erraticness) nor 1 (i.e., absolute regularity); its extent should emerge at the end of a study as one of its conclusions, rather than being presupposed.

(Toury 67)

Introduction

Once upon a time, not so long ago, in the days of Soviet era, in a far, far away land behind the Iron Curtain there lived a professor of mathematics and metallurgy called Alexander M. Volkov. One day he read a novel written by L. Frank Baum and decided to translate it from English to Russian. First of all, he took the liberty of changing the title and the names of the characters. As a result, the Land of Oz was renamed as the Magic Land, Dorothy turned into Ellie, and Uncle Henry and Aunt Em transformed into father John and mother Anna. Afterwards, this professor omitted and added some words, sentences and even a couple of chapters. Last but not the least, translator Volkov put his own name on the cover, discarding the name of the real author. And from that day on, generations of readers grew up reading *The Wizard of the Emerald City* without knowing that their favourite book was written by an American writer L. Frank Baum and known in the States as *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*.

On the one hand, what Volkov did was not uncommon. Xenia Mitrokhina coins the term “parallel texts”, referring to the rewritten titles, such as Volkov’s version of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* (1939, revised 1959) and Alexey Tolstoy’s version of *Pinocchio* (1936), as plagiarisms whose parallel existence “has been one of the numerous skeletons in the cupboard of Soviet literature” (187).

On the other hand, unlike *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, none of the other Soviet retellings got translated into thirteen languages. The case of Volkov is even more remarkable given the fact that in 1991 his version of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* was translated into English and, according to the front matter of a copy found in the Library of Congress, is considered an adaptation rather than a case of a translated plagiarism.

Whereas Volkov’s strategy of domestication is irrefutable, the motivation behind the deforming tendencies implemented by him remains contentious. Moreover, Maria Lomaka is the only scholar whose study is based, in part, on Volkov’s correspondence that was compiled in 2006 by Galkina, the director of Volkov’s archive at the Tomsk Pedagogical University. The other researchers, in contrast, do not take into account Volkov’s explanations, building their hypotheses mostly on the historical context. Given that Volkov’s version of the Baum’s tale was published during the Soviet era, there is an overall tendency to relate the discrepancies between *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* and *The Wizard of the Emerald City* to the subjects of ideology and censorship, overlooking other potential factors.

With the aim of filling the gap, my thesis examines how, and postulates why, Volkov has deviated from the source text. This theme will be discussed through a comparison of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* with *The Wizard of the Emerald City* (1959,

revised edition). In terms of structure this thesis is divided into three chapters. The first chapter analyses Volkov's role in rewriting Baum's tale by attempting to differentiate between translation, adaptation, appropriation, parody and translated plagiarism in general, and, in particular, situate *The Wizard of the Emerald City* within these conceptual categories.

The second chapter addresses Volkov's objectives by dividing incorporated by him modifications into seven categories: (1) cause-and-effect plotting: goals, conflict and stakes, (2) foreshadowing, (3) logical consistency, (4) comic relief, (5) tone and mood, (6) obfuscation of the American roots, and (7) story structure and narrative focus. This broader approach prevents my study from being restricted solely to the subjects of ideology and censorship.

The third chapter explores the message of Volkov's retelling with a focus on three aspects: (1) the significance of friendship, (2) patriotism, and (3) social critique. Apart from that, it consists of a comparative analysis of arguments of some of the other scholars regarding the meaning behind *The Wizard of the Emerald City*.

Literature Review

All things considered, surprisingly few articles have been written about the case study of *The Wizard of the Emerald City*. The scope of research is also rather narrow due to the failure to keep up with the recent publications in the field. For instance, Lomaka calls attention to the fact that "Nikolajeva's cursory essay is the only source on this topic consistently mentioned by subsequent scholars who generally neglect to cite one another" (7). This statement is only partially true. Mitrokhina's article is also frequently referred to. However, for the most part the subsequent scholars do fail to establish common

ground.

In fact, Lomaka is the only scholar who takes into consideration Galkina's book about Volkov that includes his correspondence with various people from the Soviet literary world. This particular source of information is significant, albeit neglected, since the aforementioned personal letters reveal Volkov's own thoughts on various issues related to the process of transforming *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* into *The Wizard of the Emerald City*. Equally problematic is the fact that both past and ongoing research is limited to the comparison of Volkov's version (sometimes both editions, but more often than not only the revised one) and Baum's prior tale.

Notably, only Anne Nesbet explores the plagiaristic aspects of Volkov's work, presenting him as a humbug whose objectives has been: (1) to create an impression of the Soviet (or Russian) superiority over the United States (86) and (2) to disguise the American origins of the tale (83). Within the framework of her paper, Nesbet draws a parallel between two of the projects Volkov worked on at, more or less, the same period of time: *The Wizard of the Emerald City* and a historical novel called *Wonderful Sphere*. The bottom line of her comparison is that in both cases Volkov was not above fabricating data to reach his indicated above goals (86).

Xenia Mitrokhina also criticizes Volkov, but for different reasons. In contrast to Nesbet, she accuses him of being "the transmitter (or servant) of Soviet ideology" (187). Mitrokhina goes as far as to claim that "the logic of the Magic Land seems calculated to instill powerlessness in the child reader" (186). Yet, such an interpretation is gratuitous and, considering the content of Volkov's letters, highly unlikely. Volkov cared about his young readers enough to correspond with them. In fact, he even kept the handwritten

copies of *The Wizard of the Emerald City* made and sent to him by children, providing his young readers with the printed edition instead (Galkina 178).

Although some of Mitrokhina's arguments are valid, her analysis borders on parochialism due to its narrow focus on ideological messages concomitant with a failure to address the other aspects of Volkov's rewriting. In a manner of speaking, such a reading is similar to the following abstract of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*: "Transported to a surreal landscape, a young girl kills the first person she meets and then teams up with three strangers to kill again"¹ (Winfrey). On the one hand, it is a rather accurate summary of the plot. On the other hand, it is plausible that most of the people would depict the narrative thread of this particular tale differently. After all, the killing spree was not the goal of the Baum's protagonist, neither was it the reason behind Dorothy's decision to team up with the Scarecrow, Iron Woodman, and Lion.

Furthermore, some arguments are based on meager evidence and insufficient warrants. Judith Inggs, for example, infers that Volkov had to creatively manipulate the text because he worked under the conditions of censorship and consequently, was required to meet the socialist realist requirements. However, Inggs admits that her hypothesis relies on "an uncorroborated report that Volkov's translation was rejected by the Soviet censors" (78). Her article was published relatively recently, i.e. in 2011. Yet, Inggs refers only to the papers written by Nikolajeva and Mitrokhina (1995 and 1996-7 respectively), extrapolating instead of addressing any of the recent papers.

To make the matters even worse, Inggs presents changes that were introduced by Volkov in the second, 1959 edition, as something that was published in 1939 (e.g., the

¹ Winfrey, Lee. *Inquirer Television*. Cited on Twitter. ([://twitter.com/_youhadonejob/status/490977436667228160/photo/1](https://twitter.com/_youhadonejob/status/490977436667228160/photo/1)) 13 Aug. 2014

inclusion of the prophesy and a revolutionary layer). However, as is evident from the article written by Nesbet (82, 84), this is not the case. Notably, Mitrokhina also bases her hypothesis on the erroneous presumption that the 1939 edition of *The Wizard of the Emerald City* is consistent with the 1959 version. In both cases, such a fundamental error in perception leads to a compromised findings. One of the goals of my thesis is to test their conclusions based on the information gathered not only from the comparison of Baum's tale and Volkov's retelling, but also from the recent publications on this topic.

Chapter I. The Problem of Translation, Adaptation and Translated Plagiarism

Various types of text transformations are increasingly prevalent nowadays: translation, adaptation, appropriation, parody, fanfiction to name but a few. Unfortunately, since the definition of “acceptable” remains controversial in this context, some of these retellings border on a copyright infringement. The case of *The Wizard of the Emerald City* is particularly intriguing because of a certain confusion, with regard to Volkov’s role in the rewriting of Baum’s tale, which results in diverse attempts to define this type of text transformation.

The book cover of an edition translated to English by Peter Blystone, for instance, refers to Volkov’s version as “Russian translation/adaptation”. Mitrokhina also uses slash, labeling Volkov a “Soviet interpreter/plagiarist” (187). Lomaka, in turn, applies hyphen, calling Volkov an “author-translator” (32). Inggs acts similarly, referring to him as a “writer-translator” (79). These examples reflect the challenge of differentiating between translation, adaptation, appropriation, and translated plagiarism. In fact, Inggs considers *The Wizard of the Emerald City* “an interesting example of the notions of adaptation and appropriation as a form of translation” (79). This statement further blurs the line between different text transformations by implying that (1) Volkov’s retelling of Baum’s tale is both adaptation and appropriation and (2) adaptation and appropriation are no more than a form of translation.

Actually, adaptation is often referred to as a form of domestication. For example, in an introduction to *Translation, Adaptation and Transformation* anthology edited by him in 2012, Lawrence Raw provides the reader with a fair warning that “this anthology does not provide any definitive answers as to the relationship between translation and

adaptation, and how (and whether) they can be distinguished” (17-18). The “and whether” included in a parenthesis raises the possibility of a lack of distinction between these terms. Azenha and Moreira, whose paper can be found in this anthology, concur with Raw. According to them, “from a theoretical point of view, there is no way of solving the dilemma of establishing boundaries separating translation and adaptation” (Raw 77). In fact, they take his argument even further, replacing the doubt regarding the possibility of differentiating between translation and adaptation with a definitive denial of such a separation.

While it is true that every translation consists partly of interpretation and, hence, falls under the category of an adaptation, not every adaptation is a translation. In spite of similarity of *The Wizard of the Emerald City* and *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, the former is not a translation since Volkov published it under his own name. In other words, by presenting himself as an author, Volkov has crossed a line, ceasing to be a translator. Following this line of thought, his version of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* is not an adaptation either. In fact, considering the lack of acknowledgment of the source text, the term “appropriation” would be more appropriate in this context.

The term “plagiarism” may also be applicable with regard to the case of Volkov. However, due to the historical circumstances, the practice of retelling was not illegal during the Soviet era and thereby, was not a plagiarism per se. The Iron Curtain is often referred to as the reason behind the existence of multiple retellings during that period of time. Yet, this explanatory hypothesis is not satisfactory, for the indicated above tradition of the literary borrowing prevails even nowadays. For instance, following the phenomenal success of the Harry Potter novels, Russian-speaking children were

introduced to the series of books about Porry Gatter and Tanya Grotter. Therefore, I argue that the peripheral position of children's literature in literary polysystem and the lack of a clear differentiation between adaptation, parody, and plagiarism are the main reasons behind the existence of so-called "parallel texts".

1. Peripheral Position of Children's Literature in Literary Polysystem

Gideon Toury, whose research analyses the nature and role of norms in translation, claims that "'translatorship' amounts first and foremost to being able *to play a social role*, i.e., to fulfill a function allotted by a community ... in a way which is deemed appropriate in its own terms of reference" (54). In this context, the question should be: what differentiates something that is appropriate in general from something that is deemed appropriate in its own terms of reference? With regard to the case of Volkov, due to the historical circumstances, his retelling of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* is allegedly appropriate. In essence, Volkov subjects to the target culture norms to fulfill the social role prescribed to him by a Soviet community. Such an approach results in an acceptable rather than adequate translation of Baum's tale.

It is also worth noting that *The Wizard of the Emerald City* pertains to both translated and children's literature—the strata, which, according to Itamar Even-Zohar, a pioneer of literary polysystem theory, are often neglected in spite of being "indispensable ... for an adequate understanding of how and why transfers occur" (303). Zohar Shavit, who wrote her Ph.D dissertation under Even-Zohar's supervision, is among the few scholars whose research focuses on this particular topic. Based on the findings of her study, translation of children's literature is determined by two principles:

[A]n adjustment of the text to make it appropriate and useful to the child, in accordance with what society regards (at a certain point in time) as educationally ‘good for the child’; and an adjustment of plot, characterization, and language to prevailing society’s perceptions of the child’s ability to read and comprehend. (Shavit 113)

What follows is that the prevalent norm of translating children’s literature is dictated by principles, both of which rely on the society’s temporal perception of the child’s needs and abilities. Such a perception is inevitably limited due to being rooted at a certain point in time and space, and its inconsistency can be traced through the ever changing values presented to children via modern retellings of the well-known fairy tales.

With regard to the first principle, until recently most of the editions of translated fairy tales excluded scenes with explicit violence because of the conjecture that it is detrimental for the child’s psyche (e.g., the episode where Cinderella’s stepsisters cut their toes off so their feet will fit the glass slipper). As far as the second principle is concerned, any vestige of sarcasm is omitted because children are allegedly incapable of comprehending it. Probably that is why Volkov does not include the following scene in his retelling of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*:

The Tin Woodman knew very well he had no heart, and therefore he took great care never to be cruel or unkind to anything.

‘You people with hearts,’ he said, ‘have something to guide you, and need never do wrong; but I have no heart, and so I must be very careful. When Oz gives me a heart of course I needn’t mind so much.’
(Baum 45-46)

This citation is explicitly sarcastic in its nature. Most likely Volkov’s decision to delete it is based on the presumption that children would not understand this kind of humour.

Nesbet offers another interpretation behind the final decision to cut this scene

from the second edition of *The Wizard of the Emerald City*. According to her, Volkov does not include this episode in the later editions “as part of the general program of severing the *Volshebnik*’s ties to the American *Wizard*” (86). In this context, the proclamation of the Tin Woodman is problematic not because of the sarcasm, but rather because of the comment of Nagibin—a literary critic, who read this passage as an attempt of a good American, namely Baum, to remind his fellow Americans about the innate kindness of the human heart (86). In other words, this episode was deleted because it evoked association with American roots of the tale rather than because children could not comprehend its content.

Back to the Shavit’s work, her main argument is based on the literary polysystem theory developed by her supervisor Even-Zohar. Thereby, before continuing I would like to quote Nitsa Ben-Ari, who sums up the basics of Even-Zohar’s study rather well:

[T]he polysystem concept, an ‘open system of systems’, was suggested by Even-Zohar to capture the aspects of versatility and heterogeneity in time and place. This allowed one to view ‘literature’ not only as a codified collection of texts but as a set of factors governing a large range of procedures (‘behaviours’) ... a literary system is a dynamic sociocultural structure, in which centre and periphery fight over which ‘norms or ‘models’ will be dominant and shape the centre. (Ben-Ari, 144)

Thus, Shavit’s references to literary polysystem are based on the idea of a dynamic juxtaposition of centre and periphery. To be more precise, Shavit propounds that children’s literature is situated in the periphery of the literary polysystem. She elaborates that because of the peripheral position of the children’s literature,

[T]he translator is permitted to manipulate the text in various ways by changing, enlarging, or abridging it or by deleting or adding to it ... In earlier stages of adult literature, the concept of literature as a didactic instrument for unequivocal values or for a certain ideology was prominent.

Long after it ceased to exist in adult literature, this concept was still so powerful in children's literature that translators were ready to completely change the source text in order to have the revised version serve ideological purposes. (Shavit 112-113, 126)

Accordingly, the position of the literary genre within the literary polysystem affects the way the text is treated by translators. Because of the peripheral position of the children's literature, so many liberties are considered acceptable that it would be more accurate to refer to some of the text transformations as "adaptations" rather than "translations". As Inggs notes,

In relation to Volkov and Baum the situation is further complicated by the fact that both writer and writer-translator acquire *symbolic capital*—any kind of capital regarded as possessing value by social agents—as both the original and the adaptation achieved the status of canonised classics in their respective literary fields. (Inggs 79)

Consequently, the case of Volkov stands out since the reception of *The Wizard of the Emerald City* differs from a standard reception of a translated text. First of all, Volkov's retelling was perceived as a source text. The readers were oblivious of the American origin of the tale and, therefore, unaware that it has been translated. Second of all, this foreign story turned into a canonised classic of Soviet and Russian children's literature.

2. *Translation, Adaptation, and Plagiarism: Where to Draw the Line?*

In her book *A Theory of Adaptation*, Linda Hutcheon speaks of the twenty-first century as a "postmodern age of cultural recycling" (3). Although it is a rather accurate description, it is important to keep in mind that the practice of cultural borrowing is far from being new. Hutcheon uses a wonderful example: "Shakespeare ... adapts Arthur

Brooke's versification of Matteo Bandello's adaptation of Luigi da Porto's version of Masuccio Salernitano's story of two very young, star-crossed Italian lovers" (177). This example illustrates that the aforementioned "cultural recycling" existed well before our so-called "postmodern age".

Unfortunately, translation and adaptation studies tend to be reduced to the disparaging fidelity criticism. As a result, the definition of the term adaptation remains controversial regardless of its long history. With regard to the parodies, the situation is even more complex. In spite of being what Hutcheon calls "an ironic subset of adaptation" (170), parodies differ in some of the aspects from adaptations. To be more precise, in contrast to adaptations, parodies usually do not openly acknowledge their relationship with the prior text (Hutcheon 3). Another significant distinction pertains to the fact that parodies are legally allowed to comment critically on prior texts (Hutcheon 90).

As far as the legal prosecution is concerned, there are a couple of factors that should be taken into consideration:

- Individual countries treat the issue of parodies and copyright infringement differently;
- According to Hutcheon, the legal prosecution is problematic due to the incapability to copyright ideas (9), and although the content of the rewritten text remains similar, the expression undergoes transformation;
- According to Tammi Gauthier, inconclusive results are caused by inadequate methods of parodies analysis applied by courts (203).

The case study of Yemets's novel, *Tanya Grotter and the Magical Double Bass*, is worth referring to in this context. Yemets claims that his novel is a parody and a cultural response to *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*. Yet, in 2003 the lower Amsterdam court issued a cease and desist order on translation of this book in Netherlands. In response to J. K. Rowling's lawsuit, it deemed that,

[T]he contents of the Grotter work did not sufficiently contrast with the original for the former to qualify as parody. The appeal court confirmed, arguing that the story line, place in time, characters, plot, story development and (anti)climax of the Grotter book were so similar to Rowling's work that it could not be judged a parody. (Hugenholtz 5.3)

On the one hand, there is no doubt that the first book of the series, i.e. *Tanya Grotter and the Magical Double Bass*, is based on Rowling's *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*. On the other hand, it is equally undeniable that Volkov's *The Wizard of the Emerald City* is very similar to Baum's *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. So similar that both Nesbet and Askey call it a translation (Nesbet 82, Askey 272). Thus, the following question rises: why one of these novels is banned from being translated while the other is not restrained by any injunctions? With the aim of showing the complexity of the infringement analysis, I would like to refer to two articles that were published in the *Arizona State Law Journal* in 2006 with regard to the case of Tanya Grotter.

One of the authors, namely Edmund W. Kitch, mentions two impediments that prevent him from reaching a decisive verdict: (1) unavailability of a report of the Dutch decision and (2) unavailability of a translated version of the novel *Tanya Grotter and the Magical Double Bass* concomitant with his incapability to read in Russian (43-44). Since these challenges would have affected the quality of his infringement analysis, Kitch bases

his argument on two hypothetical scenarios.

As far as Kitch's analysis is concerned, two points in particular are worth noting: (1) what is illegal under the standards of the Dutch copyright law is not necessarily illegal under the standards of American copyright law, or Russian copyright law for that matter and (2) under the principles of American copyright law, it is legal to use similar themes and the same attributes of characters. Only the use of similar details and sequences of events would result in a copyright infringement.

Dennis S. Karjala offers a more conclusive, albeit dissenting, interpretation. He criticizes the decision of the Dutch court, arguing that the novels about Harry Potter and Tanya Grotter differ sufficiently from each other. Moreover, Karjala points out that a copyright infringement suit against Yemets and consequent enjoining sale of his books, "grant[s] Rowling a very long-term monopoly on the genre of children attending schools for magic" (33). He also emphasizes the inadequacy of such a verdict by stating that "at the level of abstraction at which the Dutch court conducted its analysis, there is an argument that Rowling herself is an infringer in creating a Harry Potter who resembles, in many ways, Diana Wynne Jones's 1977 character Cat Chant" (34).

Here, I would like to clarify that while Karjala disparages the level of abstraction at which the Dutch court conducted its analysis, his own analysis is equally abstract. To quote his words, "[t]he crux of the infringement analysis would seem to lie in the relationships among the parties, and [he] lack[s] sufficient information about Tanya to make any judgment about that" (33). This statement is problematic for various reasons.

First of all, in one of the footnotes, Karjala mentions buying a copy of *Tanya Grotter and the Well of Poseidon* (35). Considering that this particular title is a ninth

book of the Tanya Grotter series, Karjala's lack of sufficient information is inexplicable. If he read this book (even if he did not read all the preceding and subsequent novels), why did he lack sufficient information about Tanya's relationship with other characters?

Second of all, if there is no available report of the Dutch decision (at least, that is what follows from the argument of Kitch), how can Karjala speculate on the nature of its analysis? The last but not the least, if Karjala lacks sufficient information to make a judgment about Tanya's relationships with other characters, on what grounds does he make a judgment about the overall similarities between the mentioned above novels?

With that being said, the questions brought up by Karjala are worth discussing:

[W]hich, if any, of the above takeoffs on Harry Potter are permitted under modern copyright law, domestically and internationally ... which of them should be permitted ... if permitted, under what conditions ... Should authors have control over the characters they create even after they become cultural icons? If so, why, and why should such control continue for 70 years after their deaths? (Karjala 19)

By asking which, if any, of the take-offs are permitted domestically and internationally, Karjala probably alludes to the fact that, under the modern copyright law, individual countries treat the issue of parodies and copyright infringement differently. Karjala's second question is more important though, for it refers to the hypothetical conditions under which the take-offs should be permitted: (1) the death of the original author and (2) the status of a cultural icon attained by the characters.

Perhaps, Karjala is right. After all, Gregory Maguire was not prosecuted for borrowing Baum's characters to write *Wicked: The Life and Times of the Wicked Witch of the West*. Is Maguire's deed legitimate because more than seventy years have passed since the death of the original author, namely Baum? If so, can it be deduced that what

Yemets did was wrong only because Rowling was still alive at the time of publication of his take-off?

In terms of infringement and injunctive relief specifically, Karjala asserts that Yemets should not have been accused of plagiarizing. Although Karjala agrees that the novel about Tanya Grotter is “obviously derived” (39) from Rowling’s book, he insists that it is “clearly distinguishable” (39). In his opinion, the injunctive relief should be denied even if “the same character is used in a new story” (39). The only stipulation is that the new work has to enrich “in any meaningful way the qualitative cultural choices available to consumers” (39). However, the phrases “qualitative cultural choices” and the “meaningful way” are so open to interpretation that there is no way to know beyond reasonable doubt what Karjala means.

Karjala also claims that in order to obtain injunctive relief, the copyright owner should show “a real possibility of substantial future losses due to overexposure of the character” (39). Unfortunately, it is not entirely clear what the definition of overexposure is in this regard, and how it can be demonstrated. Equally elusive, is his meaning behind the words “real” and “substantial”.

As a side note, although the Dutch court have banned the publication of the Tanya Grotter books in Netherland, its cease and desist order is not valid in Russia. The last novel of the series (the fourteenth one) was published in 2012. Also, one of these books is an anthology of selected fanfics about Tanya Grotter, which is rather ironic since the fair use of fanfiction is equally questionable and many authors are opposed to it. Notably, sequels of retellings are fairly popular. In fact, Belarussian authors Andrey Zhvalevskij and Igor Mytko have penned four books about Porry Gatter. Alexandr Volkov wrote five

sequels of *The Wizard of the Emerald City*. Sergei Sukhinov wrote his own (twenty by now) sequels of *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, which were translated in 2013 by Blystone (the same translator who translated Volkov's adaptation to English). With regard to the fair use, *Los Angeles Times* labels Russia a country "where plagiarism charges are shrugged off by nearly everyone in the literary world"². However, there are non-Russian take-offs as well, such as Chinese *Harry Potter and Leopard-Walk-Up-to-Dragon* (Karjala 18).

It is in this context that I would like to use the words of Dorothy from *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*: "[i]f we walk far enough ... we shall sometime come to someplace" (101). The question is, how far is too far and where do we draw the line between translation, adaptation, appropriation, parody and plagiarism. Gauthier, for instance, wants the likelihood of confusion to be the only criterion for copyright infringement (202). If so, Volkov is guiltier than Yemets, for he deliberately misled generations of readers by presenting himself as an author rather than a translator. In case of Yemets though, the likelihood of confusion is close to zero. Yemets creates multiple original characters (some of which are based on Russian folklore). Furthermore, even though some of the sequences of events of *Tanya Grotter and the Magical Double* are derived from Rowling's novel, the other thirteen books of the Tanya Grotter series differ tremendously from the Harry Potter books.

Perhaps, *Tanya Grotter and the Magical Double Bass* is a case of plagiarism indeed. Nevertheless, it is equally possible that Yemets truly believed that it is a legally appropriate cultural response. In other words, infringement, in this case, might have been

² (<http://articles.latimes.com/2003/apr/13/world/fg-potter13>) 10 May 2014.

accidental. Since *The Wizard of the Emerald City* is one of the most well-known books for children in Russia, Volkov may well be a role model in the eyes of contemporary Russian writers. Considering that Volkov's appropriation has been translated into thirteen languages, its phenomenal reception can be analogous with an incentive to follow his footsteps.

In this context, I would like to clarify that in spite of Inggs' assertion that Volkov's retelling "did not acknowledge Baum in any way, not least because he had no legal obligation to do so, as the USSR only became a signatory to the Universal Copyright Convention in 1973" (78-79), it is not entirely true. Volkov did refer to Baum as a source of inspiration in an afterword. With that being said, the aforementioned afterword was published only in the second edition (Askey 262), that is two decades after the first publication of *The Wizard of the Emerald City*.

Moreover, in addition to being absent from the first edition, Volkov's afterword was—and still is—expunged from most of the later editions in Russian and from German translations (Askey 272). The fact that the only acknowledgement of Baum remains neglected and omitted even nowadays is troubling. After all, the policy towards the transformed texts should be consistent. In a manner of speaking, both Volkov and Yemets have transformed well-known tales. The policy of translating one of them and enjoining sales of the other does not add clarity to the dispute about the differentiation between adaptation, appropriation, parody, and plagiarism.

Chapter II. Volkov's Objectives: The Motivation behind the Transformation of Baum's Text

As far as Volkov's objectives are concerned, it is imperative to keep in mind that he was not only a translator turned author, but also a teacher at a time when the pedagogy, according to Maria Nikolajeva, focused on three aspects: (1) the contents, (2) the plot, and (3) the message and ideological values (105). Unfortunately, there is an overall tendency to interpret the contents and the plot of *The Wizard of the Emerald City* through the prism of the preconceived notions about its message and ideological values.

In order to broaden the scope of my study, I divide my analysis to the following sub-sections: (1) cause-and-effect plotting: goals, conflicts and stakes, (2) foreshadowing, (3) logical consistency, (4) comic relief, (5) tone and mood, (6) message of the story, (7) obfuscation of the American roots of the tale, and (8) story structure and narrative focus. This separation of components is designed to prevent my research from concentrating solely on the message and ideological values of the Volkov's retelling.

1. Cause-and-Effect Plotting: Goals, Conflicts and Stakes

The plot is one of the main components of any story, regardless of its genre. Whereas some plots favour the element of the coincidence, the others follow the rules of causality. Mitrokhina is right to observe that nothing is coincidental in *The Wizard of the Emerald City*. For instance, tornado is caused by Bastinda, and Ellie's house lands on Gingema because of Villina's intervention (Mitrokhina 184) rather than by chance. Similarly, Ellie

helps Strasheela³, the Iron Woodman and the Cowardly Lion because of prophesy according to which the wizard will help her return home only if she, in turn, will help three creatures to fulfill their wishes⁴.

While the slate of the Witch of the North states “Let Dorothy Go To The City Of Emeralds” (20), the Magic Book of Villina predicts, “Великий волшебник Гудвин вернет домой маленькую девочку, занесенную в его страну ураганом, если она поможет трем существам добиться исполнения их самых заветных желаний” (10)⁵. In this sense then, unlike her American counterpart, the protagonist of *The Wizard of the Emerald City* is driven by an ulterior motive. None of her actions are random. They are caused by prophesy and the realization that the fulfillment of her individual wish is conditioned on her cooperation with the other characters.

Mitrokhina concludes from the resulting dependency of the girl on the collective that she “chooses friends not out of sympathy but out of self-interest” (184). Mitrokhina also argues that Ellie’s lack of “freedom of self-expression even in friendship” (184) is symptomatic of the Soviet ideology. However, the fact that the friendship of the main characters is mutually beneficial should not be tantamount to the Soviet propaganda. As Askey notes, Volkov’s retelling of the Baum’s tale “allows for both the progressive social vision of the collective and the individual realization of personal goals and dreams” (267). Thereupon, the utmost importance of the collective is not analogous with the

³ “Strasheela” is Blystone’s transliteration from his translation of *The Wizard of the Emerald City* into English.

⁴ In case of *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, the three wishes motif also resonates with Russian folklore. Accordingly, the inclusion of the familiar and traditionally Russian characteristics may be related to the obfuscation of the American roots.

⁵ “The Great Wizard Goodwin will send home a little girl who has been carried to his country by a tornado, if she helps three beings in granting their fondest wishes” (Blystone’s translation, Volkov 12).

insignificance of the individual.

With regard to Ellie's predisposition to act in her best interests, it is noteworthy that Volkov deletes a scene in which Dorothy is captured as not less (perhaps, even more) selfish and practical than Ellie:

Dorothy did not say anything, for she was puzzled to know which of her two friends was right, and she decided if she could only get back to Kansas and Aunt Em it did not matter so much whether the Woodman had no heart and the Scarecrow had no brains, or each got what he wanted.

What worried her most was that the bread was nearly gone, and another meal for herself and Toto would empty the basket ... could not live unless she was fed. (Baum 40)

Based on this citation, Dorothy could not care less whether the wishes of the Tin Woodman or the Scarecrow will be fulfilled or not. The only thing that matters to her is getting what she wants (returning to Kansas and Aunt Em) and what she needs (finding food in order to survive). This example is interesting since by omitting this particular scene, Volkov prevents his version of the protagonist from appearing excessively self-centred. In *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, friendship is of utmost importance. Thereby, unlike Dorothy, Ellie has to care about the interests of her friends.

Another relevant example in this context would be the scene, where the Scarecrow picks up the nuts for Dorothy. In Baum's tale, instead of thanking him for his efforts or offering him a hand, Dorothy laughs at his awkward movements (47). Such behaviour is rather ungrateful. Ellie's reaction in the same situation is more appropriate, for she does thank her friend (29). Thus, the inclusion of prophesy does not necessarily mean that Ellie is less compassionate and more practical than Dorothy. As a matter of fact, Volkov adds a scene where Ellie takes care of Strasheela by finding a branch that

can be used by him as a cane (16). It is evident from these examples that both of the girls are aware of the clumsiness of this particular character. Ellie, however, treats Strasheela kindly instead of having fun at his expense.

Mitrokhina also claims that prophesy presets Ellie's actions and that instead of being self-confident the girl has to be obedient in order to succeed, for "[h]er success is ... dependent upon the will of more powerful forces" (184). However, Mitrokhina's assertion does not cohere with the fact that Ellie returns home thanks to the magical shoes rather than because Goodwin has helped her. Thus, the will of the powerful force has nothing to do with her triumph. Even if one considers the magical shoes a powerful force, it is an object rather than a subject, and hence shoes do not have a will of their own.

With regard to prophesy, it is possible that it was intended to raise the stakes and increase the conflict rather than as an ideological message. Stakes and conflicts are essential components of every story. Stakes represent the reason why the protagonist has to succeed. What will happen if s/he will get what s/he wants? What will happen if s/he fails? The higher the stakes, the more compelling the story is. In Volkov's case, the inclusion of prophesy sets the stakes. If Ellie will help Strasheela, the Iron Woodman and the Cowardly Lion, Goodwin will send her back home. If she will not help them to fulfill their fondest wishes, she will never see her parents again. As a result, the stakes in *The Wizard of the Emerald City* are higher than in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. In Baum's tale, Dorothy has to go to the Emerald City. The fact that she stops by to help three creatures along the way has nothing to do with her goal.

Apart from that, prophesy increases the conflict by functioning as an additional obstacle, which the protagonist has to overcome in order to achieve her goal. Dorothy, for

instance, has nothing to lose since her return home is not associated with fulfilling wishes of her companions. Ellie's return home, in contrast, is conditioned upon a chain of nearly impossible tasks: (1) helping Strasheela to get brains, (2) assisting the Iron Woodman to get heart, (3) aiding the Cowardly Lion to obtain courage, and (4) defeating a powerful witch Gingema/liberating the Winkies. In other words, addition of prophecy serves as a connecting link between numerous obstacles. In Baum's tale, relationship between various events is more accidental.

By and large, Volkov's modifications can be comparable with the decision of the screenwriters of *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader* to change the plot of the book by adding the component of a fatal green mist. In doing so, the pursuit of the lost seven lords is turned into pursuit of their seven swords that are the only remedy against the mentioned above mist. In a similar manner, Volkov introduces the chain of cause and effect to raise the stakes and to add purpose. To quote Volkov's own explanation:

[M]uch in Baum's fairytale ... lacked a clear and direct plot line; everything in it happened by chance. I added to the story the prophesy of the good fairy Villina ... And immediately all the actions of Elli ... acquire purpose. (Nesbet 82)

Because of that, the fact that tornado is not a natural phenomenon in Volkov's retelling probably has little to do with the "paranoia of the Soviet system, which consistently mounted an active search for the 'enemy' presumed to be at the root of every misfortune" (Mitrokhina 184). In *The Wizard of the Emerald City* everything happens by design, rather by chance. However, this cause-and-effect kind of plotting can be interpreted as a decision related to the goals, conflicts and stakes of the narrative as opposed to an ideological message.

With respect to the natural phenomena, Lomaka argues that the chapter about flood “is the most reflective of ‘Soviet’ motifs” since many other Soviet novels featured the “struggle with nature” theme during that period of time (29). However, given that flood endangers the lives of the main characters, the Soviet layer is secondary. First and foremost, inclusion of this episode raises the stakes. Furthermore, it may be indicative of the influence of the Village Prose that flourished around the time of publication of the second edition of *The Wizard of the Emerald City*. According to David Gillespie,

Village Prose emerged as a distinct literary trend that followed on from the socially-minded criticism of agricultural practice and management in the 1950s ... If socialist realism had emphasized man’s dominance and conquest of the natural world, Village Prose presented in lyrical, contemplative images of man’s humility before it. (Gillespie 226)

Accordingly, the flood episode may well be associated with a new literary trend of the Village Prose rather than with a Soviet ideology.

Mitrokhina also emphasizes that Volkov eradicates the element of the kiss of the Witch of the North, leaving his protagonist under the sole protection of the magical shoes. To be more precise, Mitrokhina argues that the nature of protection provided by shoes is diametrically different from the protection supplied by kiss. According to her, whereas the kiss symbolises the power of good, the shoes stand for the power of strength (185). Mitrokhina explains it in the following manner:

Unlike the mark denoting goodness, the symbol of strength may be lost or taken away, a consideration that introduces into the narrative the possibility of aggression and envy (an emotion considered by some Sovietologists a hallmark of the Soviet citizen) and emphasizes the protagonist’s vulnerability in the ongoing power struggle. (Mitrokhina 185)

Once again, even though Mitrokhina connects the resulting vulnerability of the protagonist to the Soviet ideology, this concept can be also associated with the stakes. In fact, Lomaka points out that due to the protection guaranteed by the aforementioned kiss, Dorothy is “never in any real danger” (24). Therefore, the protagonist of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* has nothing to lose. Accordingly, the stakes are low. Hence, it would be reasonable to raise the possibility that this particular narrative modification is an attempt to increase the tension by raising the stakes.

Mitrokhina’s contention that Volkov is a transmitter of the Soviet ideology does not cohere with the absence of the prophesy, the chapter about men-eating ogre and the rest of the elements referred to by her, from the first edition of *The Wizard of the Emerald City*. Lomaka, for instance, reasons that the numerous changes are more likely caused by a criticism of the puppet theater director (42), and as such, are bereft of political significance (37).

Nesbet voices a similar opinion, noting that critics referring to the “socialist orientation” of Volkov’s retelling erroneously assume that the second edition of *The Wizard of the Emerald City* is consistent with the first. In this context, Nesbet asserts that Volkov “cared more about the imagination than about politics” (81). This claim is supported by the fact that “[b]ack in the 1939 version ... any substantive change in ideological orientation is difficult to discern from a comparison of the two texts” (Nesbet 84).

Galkina concurs that Volkov did not intend to suffuse the tale with a political context. She adds that in spite of that, due to the tendency of the readers to look for a hidden message, in 1970s many perceived Volkov’s appropriation as a parody on the

Soviet authorities (Galkina 112). Notably, such a reading completely contradicts Mitrokhina's hermeneutics. It is a reasonable assumption though, considering that Volkov revised *The Wizard of the Emerald City* in 1959, that is, after Stalin's death. The fact that the second edition of the Volkov's retelling was published during the period of Thaw justifies the mentioned by Galkina perception of the satirical parts of the book. After all, 1950s and 1960s were a time when, according to Gillespie, various authors

raised questions of the excesses of Stalin's rule and the moral and spiritual consequences for society ... the dominant motif of post-Stalin literature of the 1950s was the 'rediscovery' of simple human values and emotions, and the longing for a new, more human society ... there was clear shift away from ideology, and a new-found celebration of the little man and the simple pleasures of life. (Gillespie 225)

Thus, the explicitly ambiguous and satiric references to the authorities of the Magic Land may have been intended as a parody on the Soviet authorities indeed. One way or another, Gillespie's words support the argument against Mitrokhina's ideology-induced reading of *The Wizard of the Emerald City*.

2. *Foreshadowing*

In order to prepare young readers to the impending plot twists, Volkov inserts various clues along the way. One of the examples of foreshadowing is Ellie's first meeting with Goodwin. Although, like her American countertype, Ellie is fooled into believing that the wizard has transformed into a beast, Volkov arouses suspicion of the readers by pointing out that the voice of the Beast is coming from the corner of the room rather than from its snout (49).

Moreover, to ensure that this act of foreshadowing is not too implicit for children

to catch, Volkov changes the ensuing scene (in which Goodwin pretends to be a head) as well, adding the following descriptions:

Голова казалась безжизненной: ни морщины на лбу, ни складки у губ, – и на всем лице жили только глаза ... Когда глаза вращались, в тишине зала слышался скрип ... Элли заметила, что рот Головы не двигается и голос, негромкий и даже приятный, слышится как будто со стороны. (Volkov 46)⁶

Thus, Volkov reinforces the message that Goodwin is a humbug by repeating that his voice comes from aside, and by emphasizing that the features of the Head are lifeless and bereft of wrinkles. To put it another way, even when the Head talks, its mouth does not move and the only movement (that of its eyes) is accompanied by a creak that hints to the readers that Goodwin uses technology rather than magic. Similarly, when Strasheela faces the Mermaid, which replaces Baum's Lady, it is emphasized that as she waves her hand-held fan her hand moves in monotone, mechanical motions (48). Like in the previous example of the girl's encounter with the Head, Volkov stresses that the voice of the wizard seems to come from aside (48).

Furthermore, Volkov tips the readers off that Goodwin is from Kansas, too⁷ by describing his reaction upon finding out that Ellie is from Kansas: “Ты из Канзаса? – перебил голос, и в нем послышались добрые человеческие нотки, – А как там

⁶ “The Head appeared to be lifeless: there were no wrinkles on its forehead, no creases around its lips, and the only part of the whole face that showed signs of life were the eyes ... When the eyes moved, a squeaking sound cut through the silence of the room ... Ellie noticed that the mouth of the Head did not move, and the voice, which was soft and almost pleasant, seemed to come from the side” (Blystone's translation, Volkov 74).

⁷ In *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, Oz is actually from Omaha (113), but Volkov changes it to Kansas (69).

сейчас...– Но голос вдруг умолк, а глаза Головы отвернулись от Элли” (46)⁸. As is evident from his question, unlike the other residents of the Magic Land, Goodwin knows about Kansas and probably has been there before.

Another interesting example of foreshadowing is the quoted below dialogue between Ellie and her mother, which takes place in the first chapter of *The Wizard of the Emerald City*:

Мамочка, – спросила Элли, отрываясь от книги, – а теперь волшебники есть?

– Нет, дорогая. Жили волшебники в прежние времена, а потом перевелись. Да и к чему они? И без них хлопот довольно...

Элли смешно наморщила нос:

– А все-таки без волшебников скучно. Если бы я вдруг сделалась королевой, то обязательно приказала бы, чтобы в каждом городе и в каждой деревне был волшебник. И чтобы он совершал для детей всякие чудеса.

– Какие же, например? – улыбаясь, спросила мать.

– Ну какие... Вот чтобы каждая девочка и каждый мальчик, просыпаясь утром, находили под подушкой большой сладкий пряник... Или... – Элли грустно посмотрела на свои грубые поношенные башмаки. – Или чтобы у всех детей были легкие туфельки...

– **Туфельки ты и без волшебника получишь, – возразила Анна. – Поедешь с папой на ярмарку, он и купит...** (Volkov 5-6)⁹

⁸ “‘Are you from Kansas?’ interrupted the voice, and traces of kindness and warmth could be detected in it. ‘How are things there now?...’ But the voice suddenly fell silent, and the eyes in the Head turned away from Ellie” (Blystone’s translation, Volkov 74-75).

⁹ My emphasis.

“‘Mommy,’ asked Ellie, putting her book aside, ‘do any magicians still exist nowadays?’
‘No, dear. They did have magicians in olden times, but they’re all gone now. What good are they, anyway? There are problems enough without them...’

Ellie wrinkled her nose flippantly. ‘All the same, it’s dull without magicians. If I suddenly became queen, I’d most definitely issue an order that every city and every village have a magician. And that he perform all kinds of wonderful tricks for the kids.’

‘Such as what, for example?’ asked her mother with a smile.

‘Such as... that every girl and boy would find a big, sweet cake under his pillow when waking up in the morning... Or...’ Ellie looked sadly at her rough, worn-out shoes. ‘Or that every child would have a pair of decent, elegant shoes to wear.’

‘**You’ll get your shoes without the help of any magician,**’ replied Anna. ‘**Just**

Mitrokhina deduces from the emphasized lines of this dialogue that Ellie is dependent on her parents, who are “explicitly presented ... as equivalent to magical authority figures” (Mitrokhina 184). Yet, the fact that Ellie’s parents are capable of providing her with whatever she needs does not necessarily mean that Ellie cannot be self-reliant. Moreover, Mitrokhina neglects to mention that Volkov merely elaborates on a line from *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, where Dorothy tells the Witch of the North that according to her aunt, the witches ceased to exist a long time ago (18).

This conversation also foreshadows one of the major elements of the narrative, i.e. that this tale features wizards and witches. Additionally, it foreshadows the impending disillusionment of the heroine. To quote Askey, Ellie’s mother’s response “set[s] the stage for Elli’s adventures in Goodwin’s Land, where she will learn that wizards and witches, when they do exist, disappoint” (264). In the first chapter of *The Wizard of the Emerald City* Ellie imagines what her life would be like in case the wizards still existed. Notably, her fantasy is based on an underlying assumption that a magician would fulfill her wishes. Her ensuing journey, in the Magic Land, disillusiones the girl from placing her trust in wizards. Ellie learns her lesson the hard way when Goodwin lets her down. With regard to the last part of the conversation that concerns the purchase of shoes, Askey suggests that the morale behind it is that instead of daydreaming one should work hard to accomplish one’s goals (264).

Another interesting example of foreshadowing is the only chapter written by Volkov, in which Ellie is captured by a men-eating ogre. Mitrokhina’s claims that this

go to the fair with Daddy, and he’ll buy you some...’” (Blystone’s translation, Volkov 2-3).

chapter promotes an ideological message that “[a]ny attempt to deviate from the official instructions is punishable” (185). Lomaka, in turn, interprets it as a foreshadowing of the disillusionment that Ellie and her comrades will experience upon finding out that Goodwin is not a wizard after all (28).¹⁰ Ellie is lured into the ogre’s trap by following the instructions of the banner that promises to fulfill all her wishes. As a result, instead of getting a reward the girl almost loses her life. Still, instead of learning her lesson Ellie puts her trust into prophesy from Magic Book according to which, her wish will be fulfilled if she will help three creatures. Once again, Ellie follows the instructions. Once again, she is deceived.

Villina’s admission that she has used Ellie’s house as a weapon against Gingema because, according to her Magic Book, it is always vacant during cyclones (9) is also noteworthy. By adding this line, Volkov shows readers from the very beginning of the tale, that even Magic Book can be mistaken. The same idea is conveyed by a line, where Goodwin tells Ellie that Villina’s predictions do not always come true (47). This addition is significant because of the implication that prophesy may be misleading. Even if Ellie and her companions will be capable to carry out the task assigned by him, it does not guarantee that Goodwin will help her return home.

Notably, in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* both of the protective devices (i.e. kiss and magical shoes) are provided by the Witch of North. She is the one who kisses Dorothy’s forehead and the one who provides her with shoes (19). It is not a coincidence that in addition to expunging the element of the kiss, Volkov rewrites the scene where the

¹⁰ Regarding the other possible determinants of Volkov’s choice to include this chapter, Lomaka concurs with Inggs that he attempted to “introduce psychological depth, or at least the potential for character development, into his version of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*” (Lomaka 28).

girl receives magical shoes. In his version of the tale, Ellie's dog is the one who brings her the shoes, which eventually fulfill her wish by transporting her back to Kansas (11). Instead of helping Ellie, the so-called good witch misleads her by predicting that Goodwin will fulfill her wish if she helps three other creatures. Thus, Volkov's version of the good witch is consistent with his presentation of the wizards in general. Stella is no better than the humbug wizard—both of them are equally untrustworthy and incompetent.

As to the Mitrokhina's remark about being punished for following the unofficial instructions, Lomaka calls attention to the fact that technically Villina's prophesy is not official instructions since it is not issued by a state authority (Lomaka 43). Moreover, as was indicated above, Mitrokhina's argument is built on the misguided assumption that the 1959 edition of *The Wizard of the Emerald City* is congruent with the 1939 edition.

3. *Logical Consistency*

Volkov maintains an analytical approach of a scientist throughout the entire process of revision. To use the example from Lomaka's thesis, he turns the Tin Woodman into the Iron Woodman because "it would have been absurd for a professor of metallurgy to concede to the possibility of tin rusting, even in a fantasy realm" (24). Another great example of the element of logical consistency is the scene where Dorothy oils the joints of the Tin Woodman. In the target text, after Dorothy finishes oiling his arms, Tin Woodman asks her to oil the joints of his legs, too (36). This request is unreasonable, for if Dorothy has oiled the joints of his arms already, he should be fully capable of oiling the joints of his legs without her aid. In fact, in *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, the Iron Woodman asks the girl to pass him the oil, adding that he will do the rest by himself (19).

What follows is that Volkov reformulates the exchange between Dorothy and the Tin Man in order to impart to it logic.

A few interesting examples of logical consistency occur in the chapter about the deadly poppy field. Whereas the mice in Baum's tale have to be unharnessed from the truck (64), in Volkov's version they gnaw on the strings instead of wasting time on waiting (38). This alteration is based on the same reason: if the mice are capable of doing it by themselves, why do they need someone else's assistance? Also, the Queen of the Field Mice in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* tells the girl to come to the field and call her in case of need (64). In *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, in contrast, she gives Ellie a silver whistle, which the girl can blow anywhere to call for help (38). This method is more efficient and practical. It is improbable that in case of a predicament Ellie will be able to reach the poppy field to call for help. Interestingly, when Dorothy calls the Queen of the Field Mice in the chapter about the Winged Monkeys, she does use a whistle. With that being said, until that chapter of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, this whistle was not mentioned at all.

In the same chapter of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, it is written that the Iron Woodman has to hold the dog to prevent him from scaring the mice (62-63), Volkov elaborates that they had to tie Totoshka to a little stake (37). This addition makes sense since the Iron Woodman has to use both hands to attach the mice to the strings and strings to the truck. Thus, holding the dog in his arms is not an option. Neither is releasing him, for Totoshka would have distracted everyone from their task by chasing the mice.

When the main characters finally reach the Emerald City, Baum's gatekeeper asks

them what they wish (70). In Volkov's retelling, in turn, he voices a more reasonable, under the circumstances, question, inquiring who they are (42). Volkov's version of the question is more suitable since verification of identity normally precedes the questions regarding the intentions of visit. There are many additional examples of modifications for the sake of the logical consistency. For instance, Baum's claim that the Lion will not hurt the mice because he is first of all, a coward and second of all, will not hurt a friend (62) is substituted with Volkov's simpler and more convincing argument that he will not hurt anyone because he is asleep (37).

Whereas Baum's Wicked Witch uses an invisible iron bar to make Dorothy drop her magical shoes by tripping in the kitchen (94), Volkov's Bastinda uses a mere string instead (59). Such a substitution makes sense since the use of a string is something every child can easily imagine. Moreover, unlike the use of an invisible iron bar, it does not require from the use of magic, and thereby is easier.

Also, as Lomaka observes, in *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, "characters inhabit their namesakes in a way their American counterparts do not; the Zhevuny are constantly moving their jaws in a munching fashion and the Meguny are constantly winking" (23). Like many other alterations, this decision can be traced to the logical consistency factor. If the names of the characters consist of the verbs "to munch" and "to wink", there better be a reason, some trait that would justify the use of these particular verbs. Otherwise, it is misleading rather than funny, and as was already indicated above, Volkov leaves no place for random and coincidental in his version of the tale. Because of that guiding principle, the Quadlings are renamed as Pryguny, i.e. Jumpers. Their new name is logically consistent with the practice of naming the population of the Magic Land based on their

physical characteristics and habits. Thus, the name Pryguny is derived from the Russian verb that describes the action performed by these people, i.e. jumping.

For the same reason, Volkov enhances the traits of various characters by elaborating on the descriptions provided by Baum. To illustrate the point, when the Cowardly Lion comes to the wizard to get the courage, Baum uses verbs “announced” and “entering” (120) without supplying any adjectives or adverbs. Volkov, on the other hand, demonstrates the diffidence of the Lion by using the adverb “робко” (timidly) and the expression “переминаясь с лапы на лапу” (shifting from foot to foot) (72). Hence, the Lion’s entire demeanour shows that he is a coward.¹¹

Likewise, Volkov demonstrates the reader how cowardly the Lion is in the scene where he has to swim to pull the raft to the shore. In *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, Baum uses only the verb “said” (54), referring to the Lion’s initiative to swim. Nothing in this description suggests that the Cowardly Lion is terrified by the prospect of swimming, but overcomes his fear to help his friends. Conversely, in *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, Volkov inserts an expression “задрожав всем телом” (33)¹² to convey the level of the Lion’s anxiety that manifests in a psychosomatic reaction.

In the same way, Volkov takes care to present the lines of Strasheela in a comic light even when he says something smart for a change. For instance, in *The Wonderful*

¹¹ It is particularly intriguing that on one occasion Volkov acts in a diametrically opposite way, translating Baum’s “The Lion, **although he was certainly afraid**, turned to face the Kalidahs (50-51, my emphasis)” as “Лев, замыкавший шествие, обернулся к тиграм (31)”. Perhaps, Volkov cuts this part because it is a case of telling rather than showing—something that is considered to be a rookie mistake among writers. To borrow the words of Anton Chekhov: “*Don't tell me the moon is shining; show me the glint of light on broken glass.*”

(<http://www.goodreads.com/quotes/16383-don-t-tell-me-the-moon-is-shining-show-me-the>) 13 Aug. 2014

¹² “[H]is whole body trembling” (Blystone’s translation, Volkov 50).

Wizard of Oz, the Scarecrow is the one who comes up with the plan how to cross the river:

‘How shall we cross the river?’ asked Dorothy.
‘That is easily done,’ replied the Scarecrow. ‘The Tin Woodman must build us a raft, so we can float to the other side’. (Baum 52)

Considering that such a serious and thoughtful manner of speaking is rather uncharacteristic of a brainless character, Volkov changes the tone of this scene:

– Как же мы переправимся? – сказали Элли, Железный Дровосек, Трусливый Лев и Тотошка, и все разом посмотрели на Страшила.
Польщенный общим вниманием, Страшила принял важный вид и приложил палец ко лбу. Думал он не очень долго.
– Ведь река – это не суша, а суша – не река! – важно изрек он.
– По реке не пойдешь пешком, значит ... Железный Дровосек должен сделать плот, и мы переплывем реку.
– Какой ты умный! – восхищенно воскликнули все. (Volkov 31)¹³

To put it more simply, in *The Wizard of the Emerald City* Strasheela expresses the same idea in a profoundly idiosyncratic manner, starting with a philosophical observation that “[a] river is not dry land, and dry land is not a river” (Blystone’s translation, Volkov 48). The comic form of his remark disguises its wise content, allowing Volkov to convey the

¹³ “‘How are we going to cross over?’ asked Ellie, the Iron Woodman, the Cowardly Lion, and Totoshka, all of them turning their eyes simultaneously on Strasheela—for they were all convinced by now that his mind and his faculties were developing, not day by day, but hour by hour.

Flattered at being the center of attention, Strasheela struck a serious pose and placed his finger to his forehead. He thought for only a short time.

‘A river is not dry land, and dry land is not a river,’ he declared in a pompous tone. ‘One does not travel on a river by foot, and that means ... the Iron Woodman will have to build a raft, and the new can sail across the river!’

‘How smart you are!’ exclaimed the others, exhilarated” (Blystone’s translation, Volkov 48).

same meaning without making it sound out of character. Accordingly, he paraphrases most of the Scarecrow's lines. For instance, when Baum's character says, "[t]hat will be a hard climb ... but we must get over the hill, nevertheless" (145), Volkov's Strasheela remarks: "Трудненько карабкаться на эту гору ... Но гора – ведь это не ровное место, и, раз она стоит перед нами, значит, надо через нее перелезть"¹⁴ (84).

A certain pattern to Strasheela's speech stands out. An odd way of stringing the words together that makes him sound funny even when he articulates clever ideas. Sometimes, this effect is achieved by the usage of 'X is not Y' formula. Strasheela tends to start his sentence by stating the obvious, e.g., that a river is not dry land, or that a mountain is not a flat surface. Thanks to this structure, his remarks are imbued with a comic undertone regardless of their content. This stylistic choice detracts reader's attention from the fact that a brainless character continuously comes up with the way to save the day. In a similar manner, Volkov substitutes Baum's statement that "the Scarecrow found a tree full of nuts" (47) with the following description, "ему посчастливилось найти дерево, на котором росли орехи" (28)¹⁵. By introducing an element of arbitrariness, Volkov diminishes Strasheela's achievement, reducing it to mere luck. Such unflattering portrayal is logically consistent with Strasheela's main trait, namely lack of brains.

Likewise, the episode where the Scarecrow comes up with a way to carry Dorothy away from the deadly poppy field (58) is replaced with a line that states that the Iron

¹⁴ "It's going to be slightly difficult to scramble over this mountain," said Strasheela. 'But a mountain is not a flat surface, and being that it's here before us, that means that it's necessary to climb over it'" (Blystone's translation, Volkov 136).

¹⁵ Strasheela "had the good fortune to find a tree with nuts growing on it" (Blystone's translation, Volkov 43).

Woodman and Strasheela cross their arms, putting Ellie upon them (36). It is evident that whereas the Scarecrow initiates the rescue of the girl, Strasheela merely executes it in collaboration with his comrade. Hence, the focus shifts from the wisdom of this character to importance of the teamwork.

Other than that, the scene where the balloon with the wizard launches, leaving the sobbing girl behind is of interest. Volkov omits the part where after weeping for a while, Dorothy is described as being “glad she had not gone up in a balloon” (126). This particular part of the sentence contradicts everything the reader knows about the protagonist. This tale is about a girl, who goes to great lengths to return home. Dorothy thinks that going up in that balloon with Oz is her only hope to get what she wants. If so, why is she glad that she did not join him? Clearly, this line is logically inconsistent with the rest of the narrative. Therefore, Volkov deletes it.

On the whole, it is apparent that Volkov pays attention to the motivation of each character, making sure that their actions are congruent with their goals. Notably, in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, the dog of the girl is speechless and, overall, a less prominent character than Volkov’s Totoshka. Instead of addressing his objectives, Baum presents Toto as a creature whose only function is to serve Dorothy. Volkov, in contrast, bestows upon his version of the dog not only the ability to speak, but also a free will. Consequently, Totoshka returns to Kansas not because his owner goes there, but rather because he wants to go home, too. Volkov even offers a reason behind Totoshka’s wish to return to Kansas: Totoshka wants to return home because otherwise Hektor, the dog of the neighbours, will spread the rumour that he ran away to avoid fighting him (50).

With regard to Totoshka, Nesbet suggests that he starts talking in the 1959

revision of *The Wizard of The Emerald City*, “in response ... to the objection raised twenty years earlier ... that all the other animals in the magic land can speak, and that children expect logical consistency” (85-86). In addition to incorporating this particular critique, Volkov uses Totoshka’s newfound ability to talk¹⁶ to fill another logical gap of the Baum’s *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. For some reason, Baum’s characters do not pass the Golden Cap around to command the Winged Monkeys more than three times. Although Volkov does not change this line of plot, the possibility of sharing the Golden Cap is voiced by now eloquent Totoshka:

И тут вдруг заговорил Тотошка:
– Стыдно признаваться умному псу, но правду не скроешь: мы с тобой, Элли, ужасные глупцы!
– Почему? – удивилась Элли.
– А как же! Когда нас с тобой нес предводитель Летучих Обезьян, он рассказывал нам историю Золотой Шапки... Ведь Шапку-то можно передавать! – Ну и что же? – все еще не понимала Элли.
– Когда ты истратишь последнее волшебство Золотой Шапки, ты передашь ее Страшиле, и у него опять будут три волшебства...
– Ура! Ура! – закричали все. – Тотошка, ты молодец, ты наш спаситель!
– Жаль, конечно,—скромно сказал песик, – что эта блестящая мысль не пришла мне в голову раньше. Мы тогда не пострадали бы от наводнения...
– Ничего не поделаешь, – сказала Элли. – Что прошло, того не воротишь...
– **Позвольте, позвольте, – смешался Страшила. – Это что же получается... Три, да три, да три... – Он долго считал по пальцам. – Выходит, что я, да Дровосек, да Лев, мы можем приказывать Летучим Обезьянам еще целых девять раз!**
– **А про меня ты позабыл? – обиженно сказал Тотошка. – Я ведь тоже могу быть владельцем Золотой Шапки!**
– **Я про тебя не позабыл, – со вздохом признался Страшила, – да я не умею считать дальше десяти...**
– **Это огромный недостаток правителя, – серьезно заметил**

¹⁶ As a side note, it can be deduced from the following quote “Toto only wagged his tail; for, strange to say, he could not speak” (68), that it did occur to Baum that the dog’s inability to speak went against the logic of the Land of Oz.

Железный Дровосек, – и я займусь с тобой в свободное время.
(Volkov 85)¹⁷

The length of this conversation is significant. According to Shavit, “adding new elements to an already shortened text implies that the translator regards them as indispensable to the model” (121). Hence, it can be deduced from the fact that Volkov invests so many words in this specific scene that he regards the logical consistency as an indispensable element. It is also evident, in this particular example, that Volkov not only resolves the fallacy of the Baum’s narrative, but also makes fun of it by making Totoshka admit that he and Ellie are fools not to think of this solution beforehand. With regard to the

¹⁷ “ this point Totoshka suddenly spoke up. ‘It’s a real disgrace for a smart dog to acknowledge this, but there’s no hiding the truth: you and I are miserable dunces, Ellie.’

‘Why do you say that?’ asked Ellie, surprised.

‘Just this! When the leader of the Winged Monkeys was carrying you and me through the air, he told us the story of the Golden Cap... But the Cap, after all, can be transferred from one person to another!’

‘Well, so?’ responded Ellie, still not understanding.

‘When you’ve used up the last of the spells of the Golden Cap, simply give it to Strasheela, and he’ll be entitled to three spells in his own right.’

‘Hurrah! hurrah!’ shouted everyone. ‘Totoshka, you’ve saved the day for us!’

‘I’m most sorry, of course,’ said the dog modestly, ‘that that brilliant idea didn’t come into my head sooner. Then we wouldn’t have suffered harm from the flood...’

‘There’s nothing that can be done about that,’ said Ellie. ‘What’s past can not be brought back...’

‘Excuse me, excuse me,’ interrupted Strasheela. ‘Let’s see what can come of this... Three, then three, then three...’ He counted at length on his fingers. ‘This means that if you count me, then the Woodman, then the Lion, we can summon the Winged Monkeys no fewer than ten more times!’

‘Have you forgotten me?’ said Totoshka, piqued. ‘There’s no reason why I can’t also be a master of the Golden Cap!’

‘I didn’t forget you,’ Strasheela confessed with a sigh. ‘I simply don’t know how to count past ten...’

‘That’s an enormous shortcoming for a monarch,’ observed the Iron Woodman in a serious tone, ‘and I’ll give you tutoring in it during my spare time’” (Blystone’s translation, Volkov 138). My emphasis.

emphasized lines, in addition to being a part of the scene, the purpose of which is to supply the reader with logical consistency, they create a comic relief.

4. *Comic Relief*

The discussion of the use of comic relief in *The Wizard of the Emerald City* is pertinent, especially considering that, as a rule, scholars avoid acknowledging this aspect of Volkov's rewriting. Here, a certain paradox emerges, for while much has been written about the way Volkov escalates conflicts and raises stakes, there is no analysis of the way he diffuses the resulting tension. Such an approach is problematic since its scope is limited. Accordingly, the validity of its findings is questionable. In terms of comic relief specifically, Strasheela is an obvious sidekick due to his lack of brains.

Even so, some of the humorous episodes with Strasheela have an additional and somewhat didactic function. For instance, at the risk of sounding redundant, Volkov keeps calling reader's attention to Strasheela's incapability to count (see the emphasized part of the cited above example related to the logical consistency). Perhaps, as a mathematician, Volkov deems this theme worth reiterating because an ability to count is as important in his eyes as an ability to read. One way or another, this repetition has a twofold role of providing the readers with a comic relief and urging them to be diligent pupils in order not to look as silly as Strasheela. Here, is another example, related to the topic of counting:

– Скажи, друг, – поинтересовался Страшила, – год – это долго? – Еще бы! Год – это долго, очень долго! Это целых триста шестьдесят пять дней!..

– Триста... шестьдесят... пять... – повторил Страшила. – А что, это больше, чем три?

– Какой ты глупый! – ответил Дровосек. – Ты, видно, совсем

не умеешь считать!

– Ошибаешься! – гордо возразил Страшила. – Я очень хорошо умею считать. – И он начал считать, загибая пальцы: – Хозяин сделал меня – раз! Я поссорился с вороной – два! Элли сняла меня с кола – три! А больше со мной ничего не случилось, значит, дальше и считать незачем!

Железный Дровосек так удивился, что даже не смог ничего возразить. (Volkov 19)¹⁸.

In addition to providing a comic relief, this example emphasizes the significance of education. It also illustrates that more often than not Volkov has more than one objective. Hence, by concentrating all of her attention on the ideological aspect of Volkov's version of Baum's tale, Mitrokhina misses some of the other, potentially significant, factors.

As a rule, humorous scenes tend to follow particularly dramatic unfolding of events, such as when lives of characters are at stake. When Strasheela gets perched upon a pole in the middle of a river, Volkov lightens the mood by describing the reaction of the Iron Woodman humorously: “‘Страшила! Милый друг! Держись! Сделай одолжение, не падай в воду!’ *Железный Дровосек умел очень вежливо просить*”¹⁹ (33). The

¹⁸ “‘Tell me, friend, he said, captivated. ‘Is a year a long time?’

‘You can say that again! A year is long, very long! It’s nothing less than three hundred sixty-five days.’

‘Three hundred... sixty... five...’ repeated Strasheela after him. ‘Is that more than three?’

‘How ignorant you are!’ answered the Woodman. ‘You don’t seem to know how to count at all!’

‘You’re mistaken,’ retorted Strasheela proudly. ‘I know how to count very well!’ And he began to count, turning down his fingers. ‘My master made me—that’s one! I had an argument with a Crow—that’s two! Ellie took me down from the stake—that’s three! But nothing further has happened to me, which means that I have no reason to count any higher!’

The Iron Woodman was so astounded that he had no answer ready to counter that” (Blystone’s translation, Volkov 27).

¹⁹ “‘Strasheela! Dear friend! Hold on tight! Do yourself a favor, don’t fall into the water!’ *The Iron Woodman knew how to be very polite when he asked someone to do something*” (Blystone’s translation, Volkov 50). My emphasis.

deadpan conclusion that the Iron Woodman could ask very politely, stands in such a contrast to the dire situation described beforehand that it creates a comic effect.

The ensuing encounter with the Stork that eventually saves Strasheela is also humorously written. In fact, Baum allots no more than a few lines to the involvement of the Stork, using this character as a *deus ex machina*. However, Volkov magnifies the involvement of this character by implementing some idiosyncrasies that add a comic touch:

– Зачем он туда забрался?

Аист был обстоятельной птицей и хотел знать все до мельчайших подробностей.

Элли рассказала, как Страшила оказался посреди реки.

– Ах, если бы ты его спас! – вскричала Элли и умоляюще сложила руки. – Как бы мы были тебе благодарны!

– Я подумаю, – важно сказал Аист и закрыл правый глаз, потому что аисты, когда думают, обязательно закрывают правый глаз. Но левый глаз он закрыл еще раньше.

И вот он стоял с закрытыми глазами, на левой ноге и покачивался, а Страшила висел на шесте посреди реки и тоже покачивался от ветра. Путникам надоело ждать, и Железный Дровосек сказал:

– Послушаю я, о чем он думает, – и потихоньку подошел к Аисту.

Но до него донеслось ровное, с присвистом, дыхание Аиста, и Дровосек удивленно крикнул:

– Да он спит!

Аист и в самом деле заснул, пока думал.

Лев ужасно разгневался и рявкнул:

– Я его съем!

Аист спал чутко и вмиг открыл глаза.

– Вам кажется, что я сплю? – схитрил он. – Нет, я просто задумался. Такая трудная задача... (Volkov 34)²⁰

²⁰ “‘And why did he end up there?’

The Stork was a methodical bird and wanted to know the whole story, down to the smallest details. So Ellie told him about how Strasheela came to be stuck in the middle of the river. ‘Ah, if only you could rescue him!’ exclaimed Ellie, clasping her hands together in a manner of entreaty. ‘We’d be ever so grateful to you if you did!’

‘Let me think about it,’ said the Stork pompously, and he closed his right eye,

All in all, Volkov's version of this scene is much longer and overtly different in tone and mood from Baum's description. First of all, Volkov changes the gender of the Stork, turning it from female to male. In addition, instead of agreeing to try to carry Strasheela to the bank of the river right away, the Stork takes his time to reflect upon their request. Notably, unlike Baum's Stork that "like[s] to help anyone in trouble" (56), Volkov's Stork clarifies that he likes to help others especially when it does not require from him too much effort (35). The most conspicuous idiosyncrasy imparted by Volkov is the statement that storks always close their right eye when they think. Now, since the Stork closes his left eye even before he starts thinking, he promptly falls asleep. The absurdity of the Stork's behaviour distracts from the Strasheela's plight. Hence, Volkov's Stork serves a two-fold function: (1) moving the plot forward by saving Strasheela and (2) diffusing the tension caused by the fact that one of the main characters is in jeopardy.

Volkov applies an identical strategy when the Cowardly Lion falls asleep in the deadly poppy field. In other words, he expands Baum's generic description to create memorable characters capable of amusing the readers. In *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, only one mouse, namely the Queen, is referred to as an individual rather than as a part of

because whenever storks think, they absolutely must close their right eyes. He had already closed his left eye before. And so he stood there on his left foot, with both eyes closed, swaying back and forth, while Strasheela hung from the pole in the middle of the river and likewise swayed back and forth, from the wind.

The travelers grew tired of waiting, and the Iron Woodman said: 'I'm going to listen to what he's thinking about.' He approached the Stork silently. But all that came to him was the Stork's even breathing punctuated with whistling sounds, and the Woodman exclaimed in surprise: He's fallen asleep!

Indeed, the Stork had drifted off to sleep while he was thinking.

The Lion was furious, and he roared: 'I'll eat him up!'

But the Stork was a light sleeper, and he opened his eyes instantly. 'You think I was asleep?' he dissembled. 'No, I was merely thinking deeply. Such a difficult problem...'" (Blystone's translation, Volkov 51-52).

a faceless mass. In *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, three more mice stand out due to the Volkov's short, but funny description:

Одна дряхлая старушка мышь приплелась на полянку с большим трудом и, поклонившись королеве, тотчас свалилась лапками кверху. Две внучки уложили бабушку на лист лопуха и усердно махали над ней травинками, чтобы ветерок привел ее в чувство". (Volkov 38)²¹

Volkov dedicates only a couple of lines to the scene featuring the old mouse and her dutiful granddaughters. Yet, the image created by him is so vivid that it instantly diffuses the tension.

The next two examples refer to the meltdown of the Wicked Witch. In *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, the last words of the witch are: "Didn't you know water would be the end of me?" (95). The reaction of the witch in *The Wizard of the Emerald City* is more dramatic and comically exaggerated: "Пятьсот лет я не умывалась, не чистила зубы, пальцем не прикасалась к воде, потому что мне была предсказана смерть от воды, и вот пришел мой конец" (59)²². What follows is that in addition to stating that it was ordained that water would be the end of her, Bastinda lists the drastic measures undertaken by her in a futile attempt to escape the foretold fate. Consequently, Volkov's description is more personal. Also, because of its exaggerated nature, it is more humorous than Baum's corresponding scene.

Bastinda's death, in *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, is followed by another

²¹ "One feeble old-lady mouse trudged into the clearing with great difficulty, and when she bowed to the Queen, she fell over on her back. Two granddaughters laid their grandmother on a burdock leaf and began to fan her desperately with blades of grass so that the breeze would revive her." (Blystone's translation, Volkov 57-58)

²² "For five hundred years I haven't washed, or cleaned my teeth, or even stuck my finger in any water, because it was ordained that water would mean my death—and now my end has come!" (Blystone's translation, Volkov 95).

comically hyperbolic description: “[о]дин из пирующих предложил, чтобы отныне в честь Феи Спасительной Воды каждый Мигун умывался пять раз в день; после долгих споров согласились, что трех раз будет достаточно” (61)²³. These multiple examples show that Volkov maintains a delicate balance between dramatic and humorous scenes. Comic relief is an integral part of *The Wizard of the Emerald City*. Thereby, ignoring its role in the narrative of Volkov’s retelling is inept.

5. *Tone and Mood*

Mitrokhina regards the tone and mood of *The Wizard of the Emerald City* as “depressed ... destructive, depressing” (186-187). Yet, her ingrained interpretation is incompatible with some of the Volkov’s modifications in general, and with the content of his letters to Marshak in particular. One of the most obvious changes in tone and mood results from the fact that in Volkov’s retelling, instead of ordering the protagonist to kill the Wicked Witch, the wizard asks her to liberate the Winkies. While such a revolutionary twist is not uncommon for the Soviet literature, in his afterword in 1959, Volkov explains that he introduces this theme because, in his opinion, asking a child to kill is too cruel and selfish²⁴.

Volkov’s explanation adheres to one of the principles, guiding the translators of children’s literature: manipulation of the text in accordance with what is considered as “good for the child” (Shavit 113). As a result of this text adjustment, Bastinda’s death in

²³ “One of the banqueters proposed that from that day on, in honor of the Fairy with the Water of Liberation, every Winkie should wash himself five times a day; after much debate, they agreed that three times would be sufficient” (Blystone’s translation, Volkov 98-99).

²⁴ Considering the year of publication, it is possible that Volkov’s decision to add the revolutionary theme of liberalization was also caused by the Hungarian uprising of 1956.

The Wizard of the Emerald City is accidental rather than required (Galkina 171).

Consequently, reaction of the girl to the wizard's reminder that she has killed the Wicked Witch differs. Whereas Dorothy retorts that "[t]hat just happened" and she "could not help it" (46), Ellie says that the death of Gingema was caused by Villina's magical intervention and, therefore, was not her fault (47).

Subsequently, Volkov has to replace all the verbs associated with killing. Oz, for instance, orders Dorothy to kill the Wicked Witch of the West, mentioning casually that it should not be a problem since she has already killed the Witch of the East (77-78).

Goodwin, in turn, commands Ellie to release the Purple Country from the ruling of Bastinda. When the girl protests that she cannot kill her, Goodwin comes up with three potential alternatives: (1) locking Bastinda in a cage, (2) exiling her from the Purple Country, and (3) depriving Bastinda of her magical powers (47). Based on the same reasons, Ellie's response varies from Dorothy's when the wizard asks her where she got the magical shoes. Dorothy says that her house fell on the Wicked Witch, killing her (76). Ellie uses the verb "раздавил" (i.e. "smashed" instead of "killed"), adding that now the Munchkins are free (46).

Likewise, instead of reminding Ellie that she has already killed one of the witches, Goodwin tells her that she has freed the Munchkins from slavery and should help the Winkies, too. Similarly, instead of translating literally Dorothy's words "I am sure I do not want to kill anybody, even to see Aunt Em again" (82-83), Volkov opts to write "я уверена, что ни за какие блага в мире не решусь поднять руку на Бастинду"²⁵ (50). In this context, in addition to using the expression "to raise one's hand

²⁵ "I'm sure that not for anything in the world will I dare raise a hand against Bastinda"

against somebody” instead of “to kill”, Volkov replaces the part relating to reward. While Dorothy is very specific in her statement that she will not do something like that even to see her aunt again, Ellie proclaims that she will not do it for anything in the world. On the one hand, the words of Ellie are more general and materialistic. On the other hand, even if seeing Aunt Em again is the deepest desire of Dorothy’s heart, Ellie’s assertion sounds more dramatic.

With that being said, Volkov uses the killing motif when there is no implication that the girl is a murderer. For instance, in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* the Wicked Witch orders the King Crow to “peck out their eyes and tear them to pieces” (86). In *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, in contrast, Bastinda tells crows to peck Ellie and her friends to death (52).

Moreover, Volkov adds some explicit and, consequently, scarier descriptions. For instance, in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, the Wicked Witch threatens Dorothy that in case of disobedience, she “will make an end of [the girl], as [she] did of the Tin Woodman and the Scarecrow” (91). The tone and mood of Volkov’s equivalent of this scene differs tremendously. Gingema tells Ellie the following: “побью тебя большой палкой и посажу в темный подвал, где крысы – огромные жадные крысы! – съедят тебя и обгложут твои нежные косточки!”²⁶ (56). In other words, Volkov chooses a more graphic description of the potential punishment. Instead of implying vaguely that the girl will end like her friends, Bastinda explains in details what her death will be like. This stylistic choice creates a darker tone of the narrative that resonates with the mood of

(Blystone’s translation, Volkov 80).

²⁶ “I’ll beat you with a stick and put you into a dark dungeon where the reats—the huge, hungry rats!—will devour you and gnaw on your dainty little bones!” (Blystone’s translation, Volkov 89).

the folk-tales.

Many other stylistic choices distinguish *The Wizard of the Emerald City* from *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. For instance, Baum writes that the Witch melts away “like brown sugar” (94). Volkov continues with Baum’s simile, adding that the witch melts “like a lump of sugar **in a cup of tea**”²⁷ (Blystone’s translation, Volkov 95). It is interesting to note in this regard that in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* the only thing that is left after the Wicked Witch melts is a silver shoe (95). Volkov, in contrast, lists among her remains some additional items, such as dress, umbrella, and locks of grey hair (60). A potential explanation behind this decision would be the factor of the logical consistency. If her shoe did not melt, why would her clothes melt? But then again, the fact that only a shoe remains does make sense, considering that it is a magical shoe. Perhaps, Volkov rewrites it simply to create a more dramatic effect.

As far as the dramatic effect is concerned, Volkov strives to enhance every scene. For example, in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, it is written that a woman promises the Wicked Witch of the East two sheep and a cow if she later will prevent the marriage of the Tin Woodman and his beloved (38). In this context, Baum’s choice of the payment does not fully convey the ominous feeling this particular scene should have created. The reader knows that the poor woodman has turned into the Tin Woodman. It is rather obvious that his transformation was caused by the Wicked Witch. Volkov substitutes two sheep and a cow with a basket of the fattest leeches (21). Leeches are a stronger choice, under these circumstances, since they emphasize the wickedness of the witch, making the reader wonder what she is going to do with an entire bucket of leeches.

²⁷ “[O]на таяла, как кусок сахара в стакане чая” (59). My emphasis.

Volkov tends to push Baum's descriptions further, adding final touches to create a more impressive image. For example, when the mice in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* almost stand on their heads as they bow to their Queen (61), in *The Wizard of the Emerald City* the mice bow so low that they end up on their heads with their hind paws dangling in the air (37). Analogous discrepancies can be noted in the reaction of the mice to their Queen's orders. According to Baum, "they ran away in every direction as fast as possible" (62). Volkov reproduces it as, "они с таким усердием кинулись по всем направлениям, что **только лапки замелькали**"²⁸ (38). By adding the emphasised by me phrase Volkov shows the readers how fast the speed of the mice is.

Overall, it is common for Volkov to elaborate on Baum's descriptions by adding a few more lines to show the readers what is going on instead of just telling them about it. To illustrate the point, when Baum writes that "Toto was a fine curiosity to all the people, for they had never seen a dog before" (25), Volkov shows the readers what it means by describing the reactions of the people to the presence of an animal they are unfamiliar with:

Все Жевуны ... с боязливым удивлением смотрели на Тотошку и, слыша его лай, затыкали уши. Когда же веселый песик подбегал к кому-нибудь из Жевунов, тот удирал от него во весь дух: ведь в стране Гудвина совсем не было собак. (Volkov 12)²⁹

²⁸ "[T]hey scattered in all directions, doing so with such great enthusiasm that only their feet could be seen flashing" (Blystone's translation, Volkov 57). My emphasis.

²⁹ "All the Munchkins that Ellie met along the way looked at Totoshka with a mixture of fear and admiration, and when they heard him bark, they stopped up their ears. And whenever the happy-go-lucky dog ran up to one of the Munchkins, the latter took to his heels at full speed: never before had there been any dogs in Goodwin's Land" (Blystone's translation, Volkov 16).

As is apparent from this comparison, instead of stating that a dog is a “fine curiosity”, Volkov elaborates how a fine curiosity is treated.

In addition, unlike Baum, who mentions that the Winkies march towards the girl, following the wizard’s orders, without offering any details (88), Volkov clarifies that they carry stewpans, pans, flowerpots and even party poppers (53). By adding these details, Volkov illustrates the absurdity of the situation in general, and the helplessness of the poor Winkies, who are not suited for wars, in particular. Moreover, the list of their so-called weapons adds a humorous undercurrent to the scene, diffusing some of the tension.

Numerous other descriptions undergo similar stylistic modifications. For instance, Scarecrow tells Dorothy that knowing that he is a fool is “an uncomfortable feeling” (32). When Strasheela says Volkov’s equivalent of this line, he adds that even crows laugh at him (17). This elaboration serves as an illustration of what Strasheela means when he talks about being aware of his own foolishness. Being fool in this context means being laughed at by even crows.

Likewise, rewrites Baum’s statement that the characters “started to cross this queer bridge” (50) as “путники пошли по стволу, придерживаясь за ветки”³⁰ (30). Thus, instead of describing their so-called bridge (a trunk of the tree) as “queer”, Volkov shows how unusual it is by mentioning that Ellie and her friends have to grasp branches when they cross the ditch. Like in the previous example, Volkov implements a slight amendment in order to improve the overall quality of writing by embellishing the descriptions with more vivid images.

Additionally, the tone and mood of Volkov’s retelling are more sentimental than

³⁰ “[T]he travelers stepped onto the trunk, clinging to the branches” (Blystone’s translation, Volkov 46).

those of Baum's tale. When it is a time for the girl to return home, Baum's Tin Woodman declares that he would like to be the ruler of the Winkies (150). While the Iron Woodman voices a similar intent in *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, he adds that he will miss Ellie and that he plans to reunite with his former fiancée (87). In other words, instead of focusing solely on the impending ruling, the Iron Woodman ponders about the people he loves. Taking into account that his fondest wish is getting a heart, this modification enhances the ending of the tale by showing how loving this character is.

With regard to the Woodman's former fiancée, it is noteworthy that although their marriage is cancelled in both of the novels, the reason behind it is not the same. According to *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, their marriage does not take place since the Tin Woodman's loss of heart leads to consequent loss of love. In *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, in contrast, the Iron Woodman walks away from his beloved because he believes that, as a heartless man, he is unworthy of her love (21). Thus, in Volkov's retelling the wedding is cancelled not because the Iron Woodman stops caring about his fiancée. On the contrary, he leaves precisely because he cares about her. Whereas the Tin Woodman walks away because he is a heartless man incapable of love, the Iron Woodman leaves because he feels that his betrothed deserves better than a heartless man. This example is interesting, for Volkov gives an entirely different (and more romantic) reason to the same outcome.

Apart from that, Volkov rewrites the description of the Quadlings. According to *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, the Quadlings do not have arms (145). In *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, a reference to this particular trait is replaced by the description of their fat hands and huge fists (84). Any number of reasons could have motivated Volkov to

modify this part of the text. Perhaps, he refrains from addressing this particular aspect because armless characters present a rather appalling image that is not suitable for his young readers.

Volkov also changes the depiction of the beast into which the humbug wizard transforms during his first encounter with the Iron Woodman. To be more precise, Volkov multiplies the amount of eyes and legs of this creature from five eyes and five legs (Baum 80) to ten eyes and around dozen legs (Volkov 48). As well, Volkov transforms Kalidahs, which look like bears with the heads of tigers (Baum 50), into the Saber-Toothed Tigers, which look like ordinary tigers except the enormous size of their bodies in general, and their fangs in particular (Volkov 30).

Another interesting example of the change of description concerns the device used by the good witch to advise the girl what to do. In *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, the Witch of the North “took off her cap and balanced the point on the end of her nose, while she counted ‘One, two, three’ in a solemn voice. At once the cap changed to a slate” (20). In essence, the transformation of cap into a slate is rather tedious, and the ‘one, two, three’ incantations do not add anything magical to the scene. In other words, the image of the cap that is balanced on the end of the nose of an old woman who counts in a solemn voice until it turns into a slate is not impressive enough. The parallel scene created by Volkov in *The Wizard of the Emerald City* is more captivating:

Виллина вынула из складок одежды крошечную книжку, величиной с наперсток. Волшебница подула на нее, и на глазах удивленной и немного испуганной Элли книга начала расти, расти и превратилась в громадный том. Он был так тяжел, что старушка положила его на большой камень.

Виллина смотрела на листы книги, и они сами переворачивались под ее взглядом ... начала медленно читать:

‘Бамбара, чуфара, скорики, морики, турабо, фурабо, лорики,
ерики...’³¹ (Volkov 10)

Instead of counting, Villina rhymes odd, seemingly meaningless words. In lieu of bouncing a cap on the tip of her nose, she pulls out a tiny book that grows in size when she blows on it. To emphasize this metamorphosis, Volkov elaborates that the book that is no bigger than a thimble becomes so huge and heavy under the breath of the witch that she has to put it down. To create even a more captivating image, Volkov adds that the pages of the Magic Book turn on their own under the gaze of Villina.

The scene of the girl’s awakening in the very beginning of the tale has been altered as well. In the source text, she “was awakened by a shock, so sudden and severe that if Dorothy had not been lying on the soft bed she might have been hurt” (15). In the target text, on the other hand, Ellie is awakened by Totoshka, who licks her face and whines (8). It can be deduced from this example that Baum stresses how dangerous the current situation is for the protagonist. Conversely, Volkov introduces a touch of familiarity—a routine awakening by her dog that stands in contrast with the rest of the descriptions, emphasizing their strangeness.

Moreover, some of the Baum’s depictions are redundant and Volkov simplifies

³¹ “Villina drew forth a tiny book about the size of a thimble from the folds of her clothing. She blew upon it, and the book began to grow, right there before Ellie, who was startled and somewhat frightened. It grew until it had expanded into a sizable tome. It was so heavy now that the old lady laid it down upon a big rock.

Villina looked at the pages of the book, which turned themselves of their own accord beneath her gaze ... began to read slowly:

*‘Bambara, chufara,
scoricky, moricky,
turabo, furabo,
loricky, yoricky...’* (Blystone’s translation, Volkov 12).

them, deleting the excessive parts. For instance, in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, it is written:

Dorothy, **fearing Toto would be killed, and heedless of danger**, rushed forward and slapped the Lion upon his nose as hard as she could:
‘Don’t you dare to bite Toto! You ought to be ashamed of yourself, a big beast like you, to bite a poor little dog!’³² (Baum 42)

Volkov rewrites it as follows:

Элли смело выбежала вперед и загородила собой Тотошку.
– Стой! Не смей трогать Тотошку! – гневно закричала она³³.
(Volkov 26)

It is apparent from the act of throwing herself between Totoshka and the Cowardly Lion that Ellie is heedless of danger because she is too worried about the safety of her pet to think straight. Therefore, the emphasized part of the sentence is superfluous. Volkov also omits the part where Dorothy chastises the Lion for attacking a small dog and the part where she slaps his nose. Volkov conveys the meaning of written by Baum scene, by describing the girl’s action (rushing forward to protect Totoshka) and reaction (the command to stop and leave her dog alone).

It is worth noting that Ellie’s reaction differs from Dorothy’s reaction on more than one occasion. For example, when the house of the girl lands after the cyclone, Dorothy is described as eager (15) and bold (76), Ellie is undecided (8) and timid (45). Whereas Dorothy walks up to the Scarecrow (26), Ellie is afraid to approach him (13). Volkov also adds that Ellie screams in fear when the Cowardly Lion tips the raft by

³² My emphasis.

³³ “Ellie ran forward boldly and placed herself between the Lion and Totoshka. ‘Stop!’ she cried angrily. ‘Don’t you dare bite Totoshka!’” (Blystone’s translation, Volkov 39).

stepping on it (32). Unlike her American counterpart, Ellie refers to herself as a “weak, small girl” (88). The other characters treat her accordingly. While the Witch of the North calls Dorothy “most noble Sorceress” (16), Villina refers to Ellie as a “милое дитя” (8), i.e. “dear child” (Blystone’s translation, Volkov 10)³⁴. When the Munchkins offer her to become their ruler, Ellie refuses since she is just a little girl and thereby, cannot be a monarch (11). After that exchange, the Munchkins treat Ellie as a child and take care of her, providing the girl with a food for a trip (12). In a similar manner, Bastinda’s servant Fregoza helps Ellie by doing the most difficult chores instead of her (57).

Dorothy, on the other hand, does not rely on the Munchkins’ support. Instead, she grabs some bread and butter from her cupboard and gathers some fruit from the trees nearby (22). Also, Dorothy helps the Tin Woodman by building the fire while he chops the wood (47). The Iron Woodman, on the other hand, has to perform both of the tasks by himself since Ellie does not come to his aid (28). The passivity of Ellie is evident when unlike Dorothy, who asks what they should now (82), she asks what will happen to them now (49). Moreover, whereas all the characters sleep in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* (52), in *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, Ellie’s friends keep watch, protecting her from potential threats (32).

These discrepancies lead to Mitrokhina’s conclusion that

[p]sychically, Dorothy performs the protective role of an adult, while her Soviet counterpart is very much the dependent child. While one might

³⁴ With that being said, there is an exception to the rule. To be more precise, when in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, the Scarecrow introduces her Majesty the Queen of Mice to Dorothy, the latter is described as a “little girl” (63). Instead of translating this literally, Volkov changes the power dynamics of this scene by introducing Ellie as they Fairy of the Killing House to the Queen of the Field Mice and referring to both Ellie and Ramina as “высокие особы” (38), i.e. “high-ranking personages” (Blystone’s translation, Volkov 58).

argue that Ellie's state of mind is more realistic given the age of the two girls, this difference between Ellie and Dorothy also suggests the difference between the ideal Soviet citizen and the ideal American citizen. (Mitrokhina 184)

It is true that Ellie is more dependent than Dorothy. However, it is more realistic indeed. After all, she is just a little girl who not only has found herself at a very strange and unfamiliar place, but also discovers that in order to return home she has to achieve practically impossible goals, such as defeating a powerful witch.

Other than that, if Volkov wants to stress how helpless the protagonist is, why does he cut the following description of Dorothy's fear: "Dorothy sat quite still on the floor and waited to see what would happen ... Hour after hour passed away, and slowly Dorothy got over her fright" (14). Deleting a scene where the girl is so terrified that it takes her hours to overcome her fright does not serve the goal of creating a dependent and passive protagonist who would serve as a role model for the Soviet citizens.

Moreover, Ellie is not the only one who is described as scared in *The Wizard of the Emerald City*. Volkov inserts references to the fear of Bastinda as well. For instance, when Baum's Wicked Witch finds out that her crows are dead, all she feels is rage (87). In *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, in contrast, Bastinda experiences both rage and fear (53). The same reactions are depicted when the Wicked Witch sees her bees die. Whereas in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* she gets angry (88), in Volkov's retelling she not only enrages, but also scared (53). Hence, it is possible that the added element of fear and vulnerability serves structural rather than ideological functions.

Ellie and Bastinda are afraid because fear is a reasonable reaction of an adequate person, who is aware of the possible ramifications of her predicament. Such reaction is

realistic not only given the age of the girl, but also given the severity of the situations and the high stakes. Unlike Dorothy, who is protected by the kiss of the Witch of the North and thereby has nothing to lose, Ellie does not have such an advantage. Thus, not only her return home, but also her very life is at stake. Considering these factors, Ellie's fear can be interpreted as a logical outcome rather than as an ideological message.

Yet, on some occasions Ellie seems more powerful than Dorothy. For instance, when the Wicked Witch sends the Winged Monkeys to kill the girl, in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, they stop because of the mark of the kiss on her forehead. In other words, the Winged Monkeys spare Dorothy's life because she is protected by the Power of Good (91). In *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, in contrast, the leader of the Winged Monkeys decides not to hurt Ellie because she wears magical shoes. Instead of concluding that the girl is protected by an external source of power, the leader of the Winged Monkeys assumes that she is powerful a fairy (55). Thus, the Winged Monkeys spare Ellie's life not only because she is under protection of an external source of power, but also because they are under impression that Ellie herself is powerful. The same cannot be said about Dorothy.

6. *Obfuscation of the American Roots*

According to Kanzler, retold texts, such as *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, “were largely staged as products of their Soviet authors’ imagination, their roots in other, ‘Western,’ texts either not mentioned at all or painted as merely some vague ‘inspiration’” (93). As a result, many readers have treated Volkov’s version of the Baum’s tale as a source text during—and even after—the Cold War (Kanzler 94). Volkov could not be accused of a copyright infringement since the Iron Curtain shielded him, and the other rewriters, from

a legal prosecution. Thereby, the various alterations implemented by him were not caused by legal concerns.

Nesbet suggests that Volkov attempts to create an impression of the Soviet (or Russian) superiority over the United States by concealing the American origins of the tale (83-84). However, Nesbet's argument is incompatible with two factors: (1) retention of the American setting, i.e. Kansas and (2) anglicisation of names. If Volkov intends to obscure the American origins of the tale, why does he use names, such as Ellie, John, Robert, Bob, Dick and Ralph? These names are consistent with the American setting of the story and discordant with Nesbet's reading³⁵.

Kanzler, in turn, uses the term "Soviet absence", referring not only to the lack of Soviet geographical presence in Volkov's retelling, but also to the lack of a class society analogous with a Communist social organization, or community representing Communist virtues (97). In her opinion, instead of obscuring the American presence in *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, Volkov enhances it so much that sporadically his retelling "appear[s] even more 'American' than Baum's original" (96).

Kanzler's interpretation ostensibly contradicts the reading of Nesbet. Nevertheless, it is compatible with Nesbet's assertion that Volkov aims to lay claim to *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* by "severing the Volshebnik's ties to American Wizard" (86). The stress simply shifts from the obfuscation of the American roots of the tale in general to the obfuscation of the roots of the tale in particular. From this perspective, the fact that the origin of the story is American is insignificant. To use Nesbet's phrase, first

³⁵ With that being said, anglicisation of names emphasizes the "otherness" of the setting. *The Wizard of the Emerald City* is a fairy tale in which Kansas is a part of the Magic Land.

and foremost, it is about “laying claim” (86). Volkov could have renamed the characters to leave his mark on Baum’s tale. In this case, his objective consists of concealing the fact that this tale was written by someone else, rather than of concealing that it was written by an American.

7. *Story Structure and Narrative Focus*

In terms of the structure of the plot specifically, Volkov’s division of the text into chapters differs slightly from the scene arrangement of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. Most of these alterations are designed to improve pacing and narrative focus. In fact, Volkov writes to Marshak that he omitted two of the Baums chapters (“Attacked by the Fighting Trees” and “The Dainty China Country”) because they slowed the pacing down without contributing much to the plot (Galkina 98).

In spite of deleting these chapters, Volkov retains two scenes: (1) the scene where Ellie and her friends bid farewell to the gatekeeper of the Emerald City and (2) the scene where Strasheela, Lion and Iron Woodman declare that Goodwin is not such a bad wizard after all. Ellie’s friends recall that Goodwin grants their wishes (77-78). Instead of saying anything out loud, Ellie contemplates that her wish was not fulfilled. It is noteworthy that she holds no grudge against Goodwin precisely because he is not a wizard. Based on Ellie’s thoughts, she cannot blame him because Goodwin did what he could. In other words, it is not Goodwin’s fault that he fails to send her back home.

Even so, Volkov deletes the following paragraph from *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* that conveys a similar message:

Oz, left to himself, smiled to think of his success in giving the Scarecrow and the Tin Woodman and the Lion exactly what they thought they

wanted. “How can I help being a humbug,” he said, “when all these people make me do things that everybody knows can’t be done?” (Baum 121)

Although the omitted part resembles the scene mentioned above in that it encourages the reader not to blame Goodwin, there is a significant distinction between the two. In the first episode, the girl realizes that it is not Goodwin’s fault that he could not help her. In other words, she does not blame him for not keeping up his end of the bargain. In the subsequent scene, the message is entirely different. Instead of releasing the humbug wizard from blame for he could not do, the deleted part redeems him of what he has done. In other words, it justifies his deeds by suggesting that the victims of the fraud brought it upon themselves. Following this kind of logic, it is the fault of the victims that they were fooled rather than the fault of the humbug who deceived them.

Due to the relocation of some of the scenes, Volkov has to prolong the second chapter by adding to it some events from the third chapter. The second chapter of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* ends when the Witch of the North disappears after telling Dorothy to go to the Emerald City to see Oz. The second chapter of *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, in contrast, ends after the protagonist leaves the Munchkins and starts to follow the yellow brick road. Like the previous example, this modification of narrative structure results in an ending that consists of the beginning of a journey as opposed to the conversations about departing the next day. The alteration implemented in the second chapter affects the structure of the third chapter as well. Thus, in order to prevent the third chapter from being too short, Volkov binds it with the fourth chapter.

Moreover, Volkov separates the part where Strasheela gets stranded in the river from the rest of the chapter about the deadly poppy field. In *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*

it is a minor scene. In *The Wizard of the Emerald City* it is developed into a chapter. Accordingly, Volkov's version of the chapter about the deadly poppy field starts when the characters reach the field itself. To compensate for the lack of part with Strasheela's predicament, Volkov unites this chapter with the chapter about the Queen of the Field Mice.

In addition to changing the structure of the story, Volkov renames some of the chapters to shift the narrative focus from one aspect to another. For example, Volkov renames Baum's chapter about "The Journey to the Great Oz" to "The Saber-Toothed Tigers"³⁶. By changing the title, he focuses on the main event of the chapter—the encounter of the main characters with the beasts. The alternative title also creates a suspense, hinting to the reader about the perils faced by main characters in this chapter. Additionally, Volkov turns the titles "The Search for the Wicked Witch" and "How the Four Were Reunited" into "Bastinda's Last Spell"³⁷ and "How Strasheela and the Iron Woodman Returned to Life"³⁸ correspondingly. Both of the revised titles sound more dramatic. The reference to the last spell of Bastinda implies that the witch will cease to exist and the fact that Ellie's companions will return to life means that will die beforehand.

Similarly, Volkov rephrases the title "The Guardian of the Gates" into a question, "Who Does Goodwin Look Like?"³⁹ The new title is most likely meant to tempt the reader to turn the page to find out the answer to the stated above question. Volkov also postpones the ending of this chapter from the scene where Ellie and her friends follow the

³⁶ "Саблезубые Тигры".

³⁷ "Последнее Волшебство Бастинды".

³⁸ "Как Вернулись к Жизни Страшила и Железный Дровосек".

³⁹ "На Кого Похож Гудвин?"

Guardian of the Gates into the Emerald City to the scene in which they are escorted into their rooms. Baum's "The Wonderful Emerald City of Oz" is renamed as "Wonderful Transformations of Goodwin"⁴⁰. Once again, the new title is more enticing since its focus is on the most alluring aspect of the chapter: the transformations of the wizard. No matter how wonderful the Emerald City is, it is more mundane than Goodwin's transfigurations. The opening of this chapter is modified as well. Instead of starting with the description of the city, it commences with the scene where the green girl helps Ellie to get ready and leads her to the wizard's throne room.

Volkov also turns Baum's title "The Winged Monkeys" into "The Return to the Emerald City"⁴¹, shifting the focus to the ending of this chapter. The Winged Monkeys are no more than a means of transportation. Hence, the title is changed and part of their story omitted. To be more precise, Volkov cuts the explanation that the Winged Monkeys enraged Gayelette by throwing her fiancé, Quelala, into the river. The bottom line of this chapter is that the Winged Monkeys are punished by being compelled to obey the charm of the Golden Cap. What they did to deserve this punishment is less relevant, and therefore expendable.

Goodwin's story, on the other hand, is indispensable to the narrative. Accordingly, Volkov separates it from the rest of the chapter, where the girl and her friends reveal that Goodwin is a humbug rather than a wizard. By doing so, Volkov divides Baum's chapter in two, turning Goodwin's explanations from a scene into a chapter. As a matter of fact, Volkov frequently divides and combines Baum's chapters, rearranging the structure of the narrative. For instance, he binds the chapters "The Magic

⁴⁰ "Удивительные Превращения Гудвина".

⁴¹ "Возвращение в Изумрудный Город".

Art of the Great Humbug” and “How the Balloon Was Launched” into one chapter with a concentration on the wizard.

In the same manner, Volkov unites the chapters “The Country of the Quadlings” and “The Good Witch Grants Dorothy’s Wish”. The new version of the chapter is called “Stella, an Eternally Young Witch of the Pink Country”⁴². Notably, Volkov refrains from revealing to the readers that the good witch grants the girl’s wish. Doing so would result in a spoiler. Thus, he the good witch instead, referring to her eternal youth and the fact that she is the ruler of the Pink Country.

Since the narrative focus is on Stella, the encounter of the main characters with the Quadlings (also known as Pryguny in *The Wizard of the Emerald City*) is reduced from an entire chapter to a scene that functions as another impediment on the way of protagonist towards her goal. Because of these changes, the revised chapter ends when the magical shoes of the heroine shoes transport her to Kansas. Baum’s chapter, in contrast ends earlier, when the Winged Monkeys bring the girl and her friends to the gates of Glinda’s castle. The last chapter of *The Wizard of the Emerald City* is called “Conclusion”⁴³ instead of “Home Again”. This transformation suits Volkov since he has been a professor long before becoming a writer and academic text tends to end with a conclusion.

⁴² “Стелла, Вечно Юная Волшебница Розовой Страны”.

⁴³ “Заключение”.

Chapter III. Message of the Story

As far as the message of *The Wizard of the Emerald City* is concerned, there are three themes and factors that dominate through the narrative: (1) the significance of friendship, (2) patriotism, and (3) social critique. The first two themes, out of three, are referred to by Volkov (Galkina 98) as the main message of *The Wizard of the Emerald City*. Of course, the impending question would be whether such a message is inherently Soviet or not. In spite of Mitrokhina's assertions, it is important to bear in mind that the aforementioned themes were explored by non-Soviet writers as well. For instance, Dumas' three musketeers are famous because of their "all for one and one for all" motto without him being accused of promoting Soviet propaganda.

As far as the theme of patriotism is concerned, Mitrokhina perceives it as an intrinsically Soviet element since, according to her, motherland "was one of the major symbols to be used in the construction of a 'new Soviet citizen'" (186). Yet, I would like to stress that the series of young adult books written by Alfred Szklarski about the adventures of Tomek Wilmowski (that were staggeringly popular during the Soviet era) also feature patriotism. With that being said, there is nothing exclusively Soviet about the love of the homeland in these series. In fact, since Szklarski's Polish characters and their beloved homeland are the victims of Russian oppression, the narrative of their adventures can be described as anti-Russian. In order to avoid confusion, I would like to explore these themes more attentively before discussing the social critique and the alternative interpretations of the message of Volkov's retelling.

1. *The Significance of Friendship*

Ellie befriends Strasheela, the Iron Woodman and the Cowardly Lion in order to get what she wants. Yet, their friendship is more genuine than the friendship of their American counterparts. To quote Inggs, Volkov turns “Baum’s undeniably insipid characters into deeper and more complex characters, with strengthened personal qualities such as friendship, loyalty and steadfastness” (85). Lomaka concurs, referring to it as “a psychological rewiring” of the characters (24), that “conveys the heightened sense of importance of human relationships” (30).

Volkov shows that the characters care about each other. For example, when the Cowardly Lion falls asleep in the deadly poppy field, the Iron Woodman and Strasheela worry so much that they fumble with strings, struggling to fasten the mice to the truck (38). Another great example of their emotional reaction is the scene where the Scarecrow is stuck upon the pole, in midst of the river. Baum describes it as follows: “[t]hen they all looked at the river and saw the Scarecrow perched upon his pole in the middle of the water, looking very lonely and sad” (55). In other words, when the Scarecrow gets in trouble, the rest of the characters gaze at him in lieu of trying to save him. Such idleness borders on indifference. Hence, after translating this sentence, Volkov departs from Baum’s narrative in the following manner:

И они увидели Страшила, мужественно висевшего на шесте посреди широкой и быстрой реки. Страшила издали выглядел таким одиноким, и маленьким, и печальным, что у путников на глаза навернулись слезы. Железный Дровосек разволновался больше всех. Он бесцельно бегал по берегу, рискнул было зачем-то сунуться в воду ... Железный Дровосек предложил сплести длинную веревку из древесной коры. Потом он, Дровосек, полезет в воду и снимет

Страшили, а Лев вытащит их за веревку. Но Лев покачал головой:
– Ты же плаваешь не лучше топора!⁴⁴ (Volkov 33)

This citation demonstrates that one of Strasheela's friends, namely the Iron Woodman, is so affected by his friend's plight that he is on the verge of endangering his own life in an attempt to save Strasheela. Considering that the logical consistency plays a major role in *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, such an uncharacteristic behaviour of the character stands out, highlighting the extent of his concern for Strasheela. Inggs also notes that Volkov's characters are "far more proactive than Baum's rather pathetic little group" (87). In other words, instead of merely observing the predicament of their friend from the safety of the shore, they try to find a solution.

In this light, it is also noteworthy that unlike Dorothy, who says that they must return to the road (55), Ellie speaks about returning to the spot where they left Strasheela behind (33). This slight modification illustrates Ellie's concern about her friend. Whereas Dorothy speaks about returning to the road in general, Ellie talks about going back to a very specific part of the road, i.e. the place where they had to abandon Strasheela. It can be deduced from comparison of these parallel remarks that Ellie is concerned about her friend. Dorothy's attitude, on the other hand, is pragmatic rather than emotional. Instead of worrying about the Scarecrow, she thinks about the road. Since such a reaction does

⁴⁴ "And they saw Strasheela, clinging bravely to the pole in the middle of the wide, swift-flowing river. From afar, Strasheela looked so lonely, so small, and so sad that tears welled up in the travelers' eyes. The Iron Woodman was most perturbed of all. He ran aimlessly up and down the bank, and was on the point of taking a chance and plunging into the water... The Iron Woodman suggested weaving a long rope out of the bark of trees. Then he, the Woodman would wade through the water and pick up Strasheela, and the Lion would pull him in by means of the rope. But the Lion shook his head scornfully. 'You can't swim any better than your ax can,' he said" (Blystone's translation, Volkov 50-51).

not cohere with the message about the utmost importance of the friendship, Volkov had to adjust it.

For the similar reasons, Volkov rewrites the scene, where after leaving the Scarecrow behind his so-called friends continue their journey. Like in the case of the previous example, Baum's description of the main characters, who stop to rest and pick a flower while their friend is in jeopardy (55), is incompatible with Volkov's message about centrality of friendship. Thus, Volkov substitutes references to the rest and flowers with a statement that they keep trudging in spite of fatigue (33). These examples are significant since they demonstrate that it is not necessarily true that Ellie is less compassionate and more calculating than her American counterpart.

With regard to proactiveness of the characters mentioned by Inggs (87), another scene is worth noting. In Volkov's retelling, after being captured by Bastinda, Ellie discusses with Totoshka and Cowardly Lion the possibility of escape (57). Instead of idling like their American counterparts, Volkov's characters look for a way to liberate themselves and the Winkies. Apart from that, Volkov includes description of Ellie's conversations with the Cowardly Lion and her dog about the friends they lost, namely Strasheela and Iron Woodman (57). This addition is significant because it is consistent with the overall message about the utmost importance of friendship. Totoshka and the Cowardly Lion become such good friends that the dog even moves in the Lion's room to sleep by his side (45). Volkov also adds that the Cowardly Lion always returns from hunting with a chunk of meat for his friend, Totoshka (78).

Furthermore, Volkov imparts the significance of friendship by supplementing the following episode to *The Wizard of the Emerald City*:

– Дорогой на меня напал Людоед. Он съел бы меня, если бы меня не выручили мои верные друзья, Страшила и Железный Дровосек. А потом за нами гнались саблезубые тигры... А потом мы попали в ужасное маковое поле... Ох, это настоящее сонное царство! Мы со Львом и Тотошкой заснули там. И если бы не Страшила и Железный Дровосек, да еще мыши, мы спали бы там до тех пор, пока не умерли... Да всего этого хватит рассказывать на целый день. И теперь я вас прошу: исполните, пожалуйста, три заветных желания моих друзей, и когда вы их исполните, вы и меня должны будете вернуть домой. (Volkov 46)⁴⁵

In this speech, Ellie tells Goodwin that she is still alive only thanks to her friends, who had saved her on numerous occasions throughout their journey to the Emerald City. As to the ulterior motive created in conjunction with prophesy, it is evident from this quote that Ellie puts the wishes of her friends above her own wishes. She asks Goodwin to grant the wishes of Strasheela, the Iron Woodman and the Cowardly Lion first, referring to her own wish only at the very end of her speech.

An analogous gratitude is expressed by Ellie's friends. Totoshka reminds Strasheela that his fondest wish has been granted thanks to Ellie. Strasheela agrees, admitting that without her help he would have still been perched upon the pole in a field. The Iron Woodman adds that without Ellie Strasheela would have been damaged by storms and pecked by crows. The Iron Woodman also says that he owes Ellie, too, for only thanks to her he is not rusting in the forest. She is the one who helped him to get a

⁴⁵ “Along the way, an Ogre attacked me. He would have devoured me if I hadn't been rescued by my devoted friends, Strasheela and the Iron Woodman. Then we were chased by Saber-Toothed Tigers... Then we found ourselves in the Deadly Poppy Field... Ah, that's a dreamland, if there ever was one! The Lion and Totoshka and I went to sleep there, and if it hadn't been for Strasheela, the Iron Woodman, not to mention the mice, we'd have slept there until we died... It would take me all day to tell you the whole story. And now I implore you, please grant the fondest wishes of my three friends, and once you've granted them, then you'll have to send me home” (Blystone's translation, Volkov 75).

heart, fulfilling his greatest wish. Last but not the least, the Cowardly Lion also acknowledges that his dream came true thanks to Ellie (75-76).

The recurring theme of friendship is added to the ending as well. For instance, when Stella, i.e. the Russian Glinda, grants their wishes, she enhances each time that she would like to be their friend (87-88). Moreover, Strasheela tells Ellie before she leaves that she has taught them the most important thing in the world: friendship (88). Likewise, whereas in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* the Cowardly Lion is the only one who pushes the tree to create a bridge across the ditch (50), in *The Wizard of the Emerald City* all the characters, including a tiny Totoshka, help him out (30).

The cited below speech of the Cowardly Lion is one of the best examples of the theme of friendship:

Lion **laughed**, and said:

‘I have always thought myself very big and terrible; yet **such little things as flowers** came near to killing me, and **such small animals as mice** have saved my life. How strange it all is! But comrades, what shall we do now?’

‘We must journey on until we find the road of yellow brick again,’ said Dorothy; ‘and then we can keep on to the Emerald City. (Baum 65)⁴⁶

Volkov’s rewriting is imbued with a couple of significant modifications:

Лев **покачал головой**:

– Как это удивительно! Я всегда считал себя очень большим и сильным. И вот цветы, **такие ничтожные по сравнению со мной**, чуть не убили меня, а **жалкие**, маленькие существа, мыши, **на которых я всегда смотрел с презрением**, спасли меня! **А все это потому, что их много, они действуют дружно и становятся сильнее меня, Льва, царя зверей!** Но что мы будем делать, друзья мои?

– Продолжать путь к Изумрудному городу, – ответила Элли. –

⁴⁶ My emphasis.

Три заветных желания должны быть выполнены, и это откроет мне путь **на родину!** (Volkov 39)⁴⁷

First of all, instead of laughing, Volkov's Lion shakes his head. This physical reaction is more appropriate in this context since his speech is of a contemplative rather than comic nature. Second of all, Baum uses relatively neutral adjectives "small" and "little" in reference to flowers and mice. Volkov, in contrast, accentuates Lion's contemptuous point of view by using words reflective of his disdain. The last but not the least, Volkov inserts the message that by uniting and cooperating, even tiny rodents can overpower the King of Beasts. This moral corresponds with the entire undercurrent of the tale, for the friendship empowers the main characters to beat the odds by overcoming numerous obstacles together.

2. Patriotism

The love of the homeland dominates through the narrative of *The Wizard of the Emerald City*. In Volkov's version of the tale, even eating is imbued with a layer of patriotism. For example, Baum writes that "Dorothy ate some delicious porridge and a dish of scrambled eggs and a plate of nice white bread, and enjoyed her meal" (69). Volkov, in contrast, rewrites this description as "Элли ела восхитительную гречневую кашу, и яичницу, и

⁴⁷ "The Lion **shook his head.**

'How amazing!' he said. 'I always considered myself very big and strong. And here **some flowers, so insignificant compared to me**, almost kill me, and it's **some pitiful, tiny creatures—mice which I'd always looked upon with disdain**—that save my life! It was all because there were many of them, and when they acted together as one, they proved stronger than me, the Lion, King of the Beasts! Well, what do we do now, my friends?'

'Continue our journey to the Emerald City!' replied Ellie. 'Three fondest wishes must be granted, and that will open the way for me to return home' (Blystone's translation, Volkov 59). My emphasis.

черный хлеб; она была очень рада этим кушаньям, напоминавшим ей далекую родину”⁴⁸ (41). First of all, Volkov domesticates the food by turning porridge into a buckwheat porridge, scrambled eggs into fried eggs and white bread into rye bread. Second of all, instead of simply enjoying her meal, Ellie reminisces about her homeland.

In fact, Ellie uses the term “родина” (homeland/motherland) as opposed to “home” throughout the entire tale. The opening scene of the first chapter is particularly important in this context, since Volkov’s description of Kansas differs in many aspects from Baum’s. Volkov omits the following scene:

When Aunt Em came there to live she was a young, pretty wife. The sun and wind had changed her, too. They **had taken the sparkle from her eyes** and left them a sober grey; they had taken the red from her cheeks and lips, and they were grey also. She was thin and gaunt, and **never smiled now**. When Dorothy, who was an orphan, first came to her, **Aunt Em had been so startled by the child's laughter that she would scream and press her hand upon her heart whenever Dorothy's merry voice reached her ears; and she still looked at the little girl with wonder that she could find anything to laugh at.**

Uncle Henry **never laughed**. He worked hard from morning till night and **did not know what joy was**. He was grey also, from his long beard to his rough boots, and he looked stern and solemn, and rarely spoke. It was Toto that made Dorothy laugh, and saved her from growing as grey as her surroundings. (Baum 12)⁴⁹

Baum’s Kansas is a grey, lifeless place that transforms the relatives of the protagonist into people, who never laugh and do not know what joy is. Dorothy’s aunt has a violent reaction even to the laughter of someone else. All in all, the opening of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* consists of a rather negative description of Kansas. It is not entirely clear

⁴⁸ “Ellie ate some delicious buckwheat porridge, fried eggs, and some dark bread. This food made her very happy, for it reminded her of her faraway home” (Blystone’s translation, Volkov 63).

⁴⁹ My emphasis.

why Dorothy would want to return at all, except for the family factor. In this context, Inggs suggests that cannot retain this opening because “[i]t was not acceptable ... to describe life on a farm in a negative light in the Soviet Union of the 1930s—a decade characterised by intense suffering on the part of Russian peasants who were forced into collective farming” (85).

Since there the concept of collective farming is foreign for the United States, when Dorothy looks around, she “see[s] nothing but the great grey prairie on every side” (11). Ellie, on the other hand, sees houses of the other farmers, who live nearby. Volkov states she is familiar with everyone, who lives within three miles⁵⁰ radius (5). The subsequent addition is even more significant:

Широкая степь не казалась Элли унылой: ведь это была ее родина. Элли не знала никаких других мест. Горы и леса она видела только на картинках, и они не манили ее, быть может, потому, что в дешевых Эллиных книжках были нарисованы плохо.⁵¹ (Volkov 5)

This quote is particularly intriguing because the claim that Ellie does not perceive the Kansas prairie as bleak is reinforced by an unexpected sequence of explanations. The first explanation is very patriotic and straightforward: it is her homeland; thereby, by definition, cannot be associated with something negative. The second explanation consists of the statement that Ellie is not familiar with any other places. To paraphrase, the girl never travelled and since Kansas is the only place she has ever seen, she does not

⁵⁰ Notably, in spite of the overall tendency to domesticate, Volkov not only does not change the setting (Kansas), but also chooses to use American unit of length, i.e. miles.

⁵¹ “The wide prairie did not seem the least bit dreary to Ellie: it was after all, her home, and she knew no other place. She saw mountains and forests only in pictures, and they held no attraction for her—perhaps because they were badly drawn in Ellie’s cheap little books!” (Blystone’s translation, Volkov 2).

realize how bleak it truly is. The third explanation is the least patriotic, for it suggests that Ellie is so attached to Kansas because her perception of elsewhere is based on poor illustrations from her book, meaning that it is flawed. In other words, Volkov raises the possibility that Ellie's devotion to her homeland is based on ignorance rather than on patriotism.

Another good example of an ambiguity reference to homeland is a scene where the girl tries to explain to the Scarecrow why she wants to return to Kansas. In *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, it is written that:

The Scarecrow listened carefully, and said, 'I cannot understand why you should wish to leave this beautiful country, and go back to the dry, grey place you call Kansas.'

'That is because you have no brains,' answered the girl. '**No matter how dreary and grey our homes are**, we people of flesh and blood would rather live there than in any other country, be it ever so beautiful. There is no place like home.'

The Scarecrow sighed.

'Of course I cannot understand it,' he said. '**If your heads were stuffed with straw, like mine, you would probably all live in the beautiful places, and then Kansas would have no people at all. It is fortunate for Kansas that you have brains.**' (Baum 30)

The Wizard from the Emerald City, in contrast, contains a different version of this conversation:

Страшила слушал внимательно.

– Я не понимаю, почему ты хочешь вернуться в свой сухой и пыльный Канзас.

– Ты потому не понимаешь, что у тебя нет мозгов, – горячо ответила девочка. – Дома всегда лучше!

Страшила лукаво улыбнулся.

– Солома, которой я набит, выросла на поле, кафтан сделал

портной, сапоги сшил сапожник. Где же мой дом? На поле, у портного или у сапожника?⁵² (Volkov 16)

It is evident from the comparison of these two quotes that Volkov has introduced a couple of changes. First of all, he deletes the girl's admission that her homeland is dreary and grey. Second of all, he rewrites the response of the Scarecrow, for the lines of the Baum's Scarecrow are highly satirical in their nature. Their message is forthright and problematic: it is good for Kansas that people have brains, for if they were as stupid as the Scarecrow, they would move from a dreary homeland to a better and more beautiful place. According to Nesbet, Volkov erases this message because

when he adopted Baum's fairyland, Volkov risked confounding American Kansas with Soviet Russia ... If someone should go just one step too far and change 'Kansas' to 'Russia' in the Scarecrow's speech, the satire might well explode in its translator's face. Even the joke Volkov substitutes contains a weak echo of the central dilemma: the Russian scarecrow doesn't know where his 'home'—his origin—should be, since he, like the story itself, is a secondhand creature put together from items borrowed from all sorts of sources!) (Nesbet 84-85)

Another possibility is that Volkov opts to substitute this particular speech because of the mentioned by Shavit tendency of the translators of children's literature to cut satirical content of the text.

Back to the theme of patriotism, when Villina asks Ellie whether she likes the

⁵² Strasheela listened attentively. 'I can't understand why you want to return to your dry and dusty Kansas.'

'You don't understand it because you don't have any brains,' replied the girl sharply. 'One's home is always best.'

Strasheela smiled devilishly: 'The straw that I'm stuffed with grew in a field, my tunic was made by a tailor, and my boots were sewn together by a cobbler. So where is *my* home? In the field, at the tailor's house, or at the cobbler's?' (Blystone's translation, Volkov 23).

Magic Land, the girl responds that it is not bad, but home is better (9). On another occasion, Ellie exclaims that she loves Kansas more than their land because it is her homecountry (87). Also, while Dorothy asks Oz to return her to Kansas (77), Ellie asks Goodwin to send her back to her home country, Kansas (46). The fact that the stress shifts from hometown to homeland, adds a layer of patriotism to the overall homesickness of the girl.

3. *Social Critique*

The second edition of *The Wizard of the Emerald City* has characteristics of social critique. As Askey notes, Volkov's retelling is framed as "a socialist moral lesson" (260) with a focus on the social struggle against tyranny, capitalist oppression and exploitation (266). Thus, instead of ordering Ellie to kill the Wicked Witch, Goodwin tells her to liberate the Winkies. This revolutionary twist of the plot reaches its apogee in a scene where the girl tries to persuade Fregoza (a character, created by Volkov) that the Winkies should arrange a revolutionary upheaval against the rule of Bastinda (58-59). This episode was not a part of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* or the first edition of *The Wizard of the Emerald City*. It is such a significant component of the revised edition though, that Volkov allots to it five hundred and thirty two words.

Apart from that, all the references to authority (whether it be a soldier or a ruler) in *The Wizard of the Emerald City* are explicitly satiric. One of the most conspicuous examples is the way Volkov portrays the gatekeeper of the Emerald City. In *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* this character is described as "a soldier ... dressed in a green uniform and wearing a long green beard" (73). Volkov uses Baum's laconic and more or less impartial description as a starting point, basing his own version of the mentioned

above soldier on one of his traits, namely the long beard. Consequently, Baum's character undergoes a transformation, turning from a soldier with a long beard into the narcissistic Soldier who brushes his long beard instead of doing his job:

На стене стоял высокий Солдат, одетый в зеленый мундир. Зеленая борода Солдата спускалась ниже колен. Он ужасно гордился своей бородой, и неудивительно: другой такой не было в стране Гудвина. Завистники говорили, что у Солдата не было никаких достоинств, кроме бороды, и что борода поставила его в то высокое положение, которое он занимал.

В руках у Солдата были зеркальце и гребешок. Он смотрелся в зеркальце и расчесывал гребешком свою великолепную бороду, и это занятие настолько поглощало его внимание, что он ничего не видел и не слышал⁵³. (Volkov 43)

Volkov starts with a clarification regarding the length of the Soldier's beard. Instead of using the adjective "long", Volkov makes it clear that the beard reaches below his knees. The subsequent information is more significant though. According to Volkov's characterization, the only trait that enables the Soldier to get this post (his long beard) prevents him from being competent. Here, a paradox emerges, for the Soldier is hired because of the cause of his incompetency, the extent of which is evident from the way he handles the main characters when they reach the gates. Like before, Volkov's version differs drastically from Baum's. In *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, the soldier responds

⁵³ "Atop the wall stood a tall Soldier dressed in a uniform with a green jacket. The Soldier's green beard reached down below his knees. He was dreadfully proud of his beard, and with good reason, for there was none like it in all of Goodwin's Land. Those envious of the Soldier said that he had no merit other than his beard, and that it was his beard alone that had been responsible for his rise to the high position that he occupied.

The Soldier was holding a small hand-mirror and a comb in his hand. He was looking at himself in the mirror and arranging his magnificent beard with the comb, and this occupation engaged his attention so completely that he saw and heard nothing else" (Blystone's translation, Volkov 69).

immediately to the Guardian of the Gates, who informs him that Dorothy and her friends wish to see Oz. Their exchange is very brief:

‘Here are strangers,’ said the Guardian of the Gates to him, ‘and they demand to see the Great Oz.’

‘Step inside,’ answered the soldier, ‘and I will carry your message to him’. (Baum 73)

Volkov, on the other hand, assigns two hundred and forty nine words to the expansion of this scene. This elaboration seems to serve one purpose only—to show that the Soldier is so preoccupied with his beard that it takes the main characters thirty minutes of yelling and roaring to catch his attention. Moreover, instead of showing any vestige of remorse, the Soldier shrugs this delay off as an insignificant matter unworthy of the further discussion. It can be deduced from his “only thirty minutes?” nonchalant response that usually it takes even longer to divert his attention from his precious beard.

The portrayal of rulers in *The Wizard of the Emerald City* is equally mocking and overtly ambivalent in its nature. Notably, *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* is bereft of this level of double entendre. Like the earlier example with the Soldier, Baum’s descriptions of the rulers are quite concise and straight-forward. For instance, he states that the Winkies “had grown so fond of the Tin Woodman that they begged him to stay and rule over them” (99). In essence, there is no indication of ambiguity in Baum’s wording. To use the words of Lomaka, his prose is “straight-forward” (15) and “unadorned” (22). In case of Volkov, the matters are deliberately abstruse, and thereby open to interpretation. By way of illustration, he rewrites the request of Winkies in the following manner:

Из толпы вышли три седобородых старика, обратились к Железному Дровосеку и почтительно просили его стать правителем их страны. Мигунам ужасно нравился ослепительно блестящий Железный

Дровосек, его стройная осанка, когда он величественно шел с золотым топором на плече.

– Оставайтесь с нами! – просили его Мигуны. – Мы так беспомощны и робки. Нам нужен государь, который мог бы защитить нас от врагов. Вдруг на нас нападет какая-нибудь злая волшебница и снова поработит нас! Мы очень просим вас!

При одной мысли о злой волшебнице Мигуны взвыли от ужаса. – Нет больше злых волшебниц в стране Гудвина! – с гордостью возразил Страшила. – Мы с Элли истребили их всех!

Мигуны вытерли слезы и продолжали:

– Подумайте и о том как удобен такой правитель: он не ест, не пьет и, значит, не будет обременять нас налогами. И если он пострадает в битве с врагами, мы сможем починить его: у нас уже есть опыт⁵⁴. (Volkov 62)

It is apparent that whereas Baum's Winkies ask Tin Woodman to become their ruler because of the fondness they have for him, Volkov's Winkies base their selection on a more pragmatic reasons, electing the Iron Woodman because of:

- (1) His shiny appearance and the manner of bearing;
- (2) His capability to protect them from potential enemies;
- (3) The convenience of having a ruler who does not eat or drink concomitant with

⁵⁴ “Three gray-bearded old men stepped out from the crowd, and they respectfully addressed the Iron Woodman and asked him to become the ruler of their land. The Winkies admired the blindingly brilliant Iron Woodman in the worst way, and the graceful bearing he assumed when he walked along in his stately manner, his golden ax on his shoulder.

‘Stay with us!’ The Winkies begged him. ‘We’re so helpless and timid. We need a ruler who can protect us against enemies. Some other wicked witch might attack us and put us back into bondage! We beseech you very much!’ The Winkies gave out howls of fear at the mere thought of a wicked witch.

‘There are no wicked witches left in Goodwin’s Land,’ responded Strasheela with pride. ‘Ellie and I have exterminated them all!’

The Winkies wiped away their tears and continued: ‘Think of how convenient such a monarch would be: he doesn’t eat and he doesn’t drink, which means he won’t burden us with taxes. And if he gets the worst of it while battling enemies, we’ll be able to repair him: that’s something we’ve had experience in doing’” (Blystone’s translation, Volkov 99).

the incentive of the consequent tax relief;

(4) The guarantee that if anything will happen to the Iron Woodman during battle, they will be able to fix him since they have a prior experience.

It is apparent from the comparative analysis of these parallel scenes that the argumentation of the Winkies in *The Wizard of the Emerald City* is based on logic and common sense rather than on their emotions. In *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, in contrast, they rely on their feelings rather than on the voice of reason.

Also, many of the references to monarchs of the Magic Land are infused with a certain materialistic undercurrent. For instance, after Bastinda gets melted, the Winkies bestow upon the Cowardly Lion and Totoshka golden collars as a token of gratitude. This scene, which is absent from the *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, is followed by Volkov's obscure remark that the Cowardly Lion agrees to wear the collar only after he is told that all the kings wear golden collars. In other words, the Cowardly Lion decides to get used to the collar in advance since he plans on becoming the King of Beasts in the future (62-63). This scene reminds the reader that everything has a price. Thus, even kings have to wear a so-called collar (in case of the Cowardly Lion, literally) that restrains them, albeit their collar is golden.

Another interesting example along similar lines pertains to the Goodwin's parting. According to *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, the residents of the Emerald City grieve over it "for many days ... and would not be comforted" (125). Conversely, in *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, people do not grieve much because their new ruler is so smart that his brains burst out of his head in the shape of pins and needles (74). Like the Winkies, the inhabitants of the Emerald City in Volkov's appropriation rely solely on their common

sense whenever their rulers and potential rulers are considered. Thus, while their American counterparts mourn, Russian dwellers of the Emerald City admire the physical evidence of the wisdom of their new monarch. In this context, Strasheela's reaction to becoming a ruler is also worth discussing. As Volkov puts it,

Сделавшись правителем, Страшила сразу осуществил свои давнишние мечты: он завел себе зеленый бархатный костюм и новую шляпу, к полям которой приказал подшить серебряные бубенчики от старой шляпы; на ногах у него блестели ярко начищенные зеленые сапоги из самой лучшей кожи⁵⁵. (Volkov 75)

This citation demonstrates that instead of thinking about the people he is entrusted with, Strasheela egoistically fulfills his own material wishes by getting new attire. In contrast to the Scarecrow, Strasheela alters his comportment as soon as his social status undergoes a change. This behavioral shift is evident when Strasheela stops singing because, in his opinion, it is unbecoming for him to lose his dignity in such a manner (77). As a result of his superficial attitude, Strasheela is as incompetent as the Soldier who puts taking care of his beard above the fulfillment of his obligations. Considering that nothing is coincidental in Volkov's version of narrative, it is noteworthy that out of all hypothetical candidates, Strasheela appoints this very Soldier as his substitute when it is time to continue his journey with Ellie. To quote from *The Wizard of the Emerald City*:

Дин Гиор тотчас уселся на трон и уверил Страшилу, что во время его отсутствия дела будут идти самым наилучшим образом, потому что он, Солдат, не оставит своего поста ни на минутку и даже есть и

⁵⁵ “Now that he had become monarch, Strasheela was quick to make his long-standing dreams a reality: he got himself a green velvet suit and a new hat, and he had the silver bells from his old hat sewn onto the brim of this new one. Brightly polished green boots, made of the finest leather, sparkled on his feet” (Blystone's translation, Volkov 123).

спать будет на троне. Таким образом, никто не сможет захватить власть, пока правитель будет путешествовать⁵⁶. (Volkov 77)

This citation is as humorous and ambivalent as the rest of the examples referred to in this sub-section of my thesis. On the one hand, the argumentation of the Soldier makes no sense. According to his logic, no one will be able to occupy the throne during Strasheela's absence merely because he, the Soldier, will sit, eat and sleep on it until his return. On the other hand, the representation of the power and the characteristics of the rulers in *The Wizard of Emerald City* are thought-provoking.

To use the words of Mitrokhina, “the image of authority in the Russian folk tale is ambivalent. More often than not, the figure of the ruler is treated satirically, and the theme of the achievement of power by imposters is common” (185). If so, the question is, what motivates Volkov to supplement his retelling with such satiric ambiguity: retention of the motifs of the Russian folklore, or an attempt to use an Aesopian language? Regardless of the Volkov's message, the use of humour allows him to add it to the book without being censored and without boring the target audience. One way or another, the quoted above examples prove Nesbet's contention that *The Wizard of the Emerald City* is full of “ambiguously satirical witticisms and situations” (91).

Askey interprets Volkov's satirical references to monarchs of the Magic Land as a “refutation of many different forms of state control” (268). In this context, she stresses that universal, fairy-tale format of the tale opens the hermeneutics of *The Wizard of the*

⁵⁶ “Din Gior seated himself at once on the throne, and he assured Strasheela that during his absence, matters of state would be carried out in the finest manner possible, because he, the Soldier, would not leave his post for a minute, and would even eat and sleep on the throne. Thus, no one else would be able to seize the power while the monarch was on the road” (Blystone's translation, Volkov 125).

Emerald City to the possibility of a broader reading, which is not limited to “the socialist interpretive schema of the proletariat fighting the corruption of big capital” (268). Askey exemplifies her argument by elaborating that the reader can interpret the fraudulent structure of the Emerald City “as commentaries on capitalism in the West, commentaries on any form of tyranny, including that of the USSR or GDR” (271).

Askey adds that “Volkov adds another moral to the story in his own afterword to the 1959 edition. He writes that ... ‘The fairy tale teaches that every lie, every deception comes to light in the end’” (270). However, since *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* transmits the same message, it is improbable that this moral was added by Volkov to the narrative of the tale. The fact that he refers to it in an afterword of the 1959 edition of *The Wizard of the Emerald City* is not necessarily indicative of the novelty of this idea. It would be reasonable to suggest that Volkov chooses to address this particular aspect of the tale in an afterword in order to emphasize it, making sure that his young readers will learn the lesson. None of the modifications incorporated by Volkov indicates that this moral was added by him. On the contrary, the plot of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* consists of the same elements, relating to the subject of deception and truth.

4. *Other Interpretations*

There are many interpretations regarding the meaning behind the ending of *The Wizard of the Emerald City*. Mitrokhina, for instance, claims that unlike Dorothy, who returns to Kansas because she is worried about her aunt and uncle, Ellie returns home only because she “longs to be once again under the wardship” of her parents (184). This reading is consistent with Mitrokhina’s insistence to view Volkov as the transmitter of the Soviet ideology. In her opinion, he presents the protagonist as a “dependent child” (184) since

dependency and obedience are the qualities expected from the “ideal Soviet citizen” (184). Yet, such an interpretation is highly subjective and not necessarily correct.

Dorothy exclaims that she wants the wizard to transport her to Kansas (36, 110). Ellie, in turn, clarifies that she wants him to send her back to her dad and mom (20, 66). This addition is not analogous with the heroine’s dependency on her parents though. In fact, it is only natural for a little girl with loving parents to miss them the first time she is far away from home. With that being said, the idea of homeland takes precedence over the idea of family. Thereby, whereas Dorothy cries because she thinks she will never see her aunt and uncle again (82), Ellie sobs since she believes that she will never return home (50).

In this context, Lomaka claims that “[a]lthough it is Dorothy who famously declares, ‘there is no place like home,’ it is Ellie who actually seems to want to return” (25). To exemplify her point, Lomaka compares both endings, concluding that the reunion of Dorothy with her aunt is “verging on comical in its lack of pathos” (27). In her opinion, the reactions of both parties in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* are perfunctory and, like Dorothy’s motivation to return home, are designed to serve a rhetorical and structural function of the narrative (26). The ending of *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, in contrast, is more emotional⁵⁷. Lomaka concludes that while Dorothy values her trip to Oz above all, for Ellie the return home is equally important (27).

Askey offers another interpretation of Ellie’s wish to return home. Unlike Mitrokhina, instead of focusing on the girl’s vulnerability, Askey notes that by returning

⁵⁷ Notably, in the citation provided by Lomaka from *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, Ellie reunites with Aunt Em and Uncle John. This is probably a typo since, judging from the rest of her thesis, Lomaka is well aware of the fact that Volkov has transformed Baum’s Uncle Henry and Aunt Em into father John and mother Anna.

home Ellie turns down an opportunity to be a monarch. By addressing this detail, Askey presents Ellie as a powerful figure rather than as a weak and helpless girl in a need of wardship. Askey also refutes Lomaka's reading by claiming that concern for parents has nothing to do with Ellie's motivation to return. Askey argues that Ellie returns to Kansas because of a sense of belonging combined with an obligation she feels towards her home. Based on the scenes added by Volkov that depict Ellie's various chores and the way she and her parents take care of their house after each hurricane, Ellie returns to Kansas to work (265). In fact, according to Askey, the main message of Volkov's retelling is that one should work instead of daydreaming.

Mitrokhina, in contrast, surmises that the logic of the Magic Land "seems calculated to instill powerlessness in the child reader" (186). Clearly, such an assertion stems from, but is not necessarily congruent with, her underlying premise that all the alterations in *The Wizard of the Emerald City* revolve around the ideological message. Notably, in spite of likeness of their stance regarding Volkov's association with Soviet politics, Kanzler offers a conflicting interpretation regarding the message of the story and, accordingly, its hypothetical impact on the readers.

In spite of concurring that *The Wizard of the Emerald City* is "rather deeply anchored in early Soviet cultural politics" (92), Kanzler does not relate the logic of Volkov's retelling to installation of powerlessness in young readers. On the contrary, Kanzler sees *The Wizard of the Emerald City* as "a story of the seemingly weak winning out against the seemingly strong, celebrating the power of a little girl and her little friends, and highlighting the significance of their friendship" (98). In this sense then, Kanzler's hermeneutics of Volkov's retelling refutes Mitrokhina's reading since she does

not view it as something detrimental for the child's psyche.

Mitrokhina, however, reads *The Wizard of the Emerald City* as a story of the punishment of a girl who has the audacity to dream about a better life. To be more precise, Mitrokhina deduces from Ellie's conversation with her mother about wizards that the girl "has broken a taboo" by "imagining how her humdrum life might be improved by access to more consumer goods" (186). Yet, an argument that Ellie's journey to the Magic Land is designed to teach her a lesson is problematic, for a couple of reasons.

First of all, the rest of the narrative is very similar to *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. Even though the brief conversation, added by Volkov in the first chapter, may be of utmost importance indeed, it is improbable that the entire meaning of *The Wizard of the Emerald City* is defined by it. Even if the talk about wizards could have such an influence on the overall message of the tale, it is unlikely that such an important component is overlooked by anyone but Mitrokhina. Yet, other scholars interpret the dialogue between Ellie and her mother differently.

Second of all, Mitrokhina's contention that this story is about a punishment is incompatible with the ending of the tale, which explicitly suggests that Ellie is rewarded. When the girl returns home, the first three things she says are: (1) that she was in Goodwin's Magic Land, (2) that she thought about her parents all the time, and (3) she asks her father whether he went to the fair while she was gone (Volkov 89). To put it another way, Ellie's very first question is related to, as Mitrokhina has termed it, "consumer goods" (Mitrokhina 186). This implies the demeanour of the girl does not change during, or after, her journey. The tale that starts with a conversation about consumer goods and fair ends by addressing the very same topic.

The bottom line of the exchange about wizards is that Ellie wants new shoes. According to her mother, Ellie's father will purchase her new shoes when he will take Ellie to the fair (6). Ironically, Ellie gets what she wants, that is shoes, as soon as she lands in the Magic Land. In fact, the shoes acquired by her exceed all her expectations, for in addition to being beautiful they are capable of fulfilling any wish. However, Ellie loses these shoes on her way to Kansas. Thus, considering her lack of shoes, Ellie's question about fair is logically consistent with the narrative, albeit does not cohere with Mitrokhina's assertions that the journey to the Magic Land was meant to teach Ellie not to dream about consumer goods and a better future.

Ellie's return home is triumphant, and the last scene of *The Wizard of the Emerald City* (I would like to emphasize that this scene is added by Volkov) suggests that instead of being punished Ellie is rewarded by getting what she wants. Dorothy's return home is also triumphant because her wish to return home is finally fulfilled, but Ellie gets an additional reward. In the last chapter of *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, Ellie's father takes her to the fair. Such an ending suggests that the materialist dream of the girl is about to come true—she will get new shoes in the near future. Consequently, Ellie's return home is more triumphant than Dorothy's since both of her wishes are fulfilled.

However, perhaps the main message of *The Wizard of the Emerald City* does not relate to the girl's return home after all. In the opinion of Lomaka,

Were the story primarily about self-confidence or the value of home (and that is not to say those are not elemental components as well), then it would not have the Wizard as its namesake, both in the United States and the Soviet Union. The story *is* about the Wizard, however, and it is his type of 'magic' that came to define the twentieth century—the magic of technology and sales. (Lomaka 50)

It is quite possible that Volkov's retelling is about Goodwin and his "magic" rather than about a girl who wants to return home. The bottom line is, there are multiple possible readings of this story. In fact, one of the goals of my thesis has been to show that many of these interpretations has little to do with the subjects of censorship and ideology. Thus, limiting one's study solely to this framework compromises one's findings.

Conclusion

The goal of my thesis was to examine Volkov's motivation behind the transformation of Baum's text. Overall, there is a tendency to relate the discrepancies between *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* and *The Wizard of the Emerald City* to the influence of ideology and censorship, overlooking in the process the other potential factors. In order to create a broader context, I use seven categories to analyze Volkov's objectives: (1) cause-and-effect plotting: goals, conflict and stakes, (2) foreshadowing, (3) logical consistency, (4) comic relief, (5) tone and mood, (6) obfuscation of the American roots and (7) story structure and narrative focus. In addition to comparing *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* with *The Wizard of the Emerald City*, my thesis attempts to situate Volkov's retelling within the conceptual parameters of translation, adaptation, appropriation, parody and translated plagiarism.

It is still not entirely clear to which among these types of transformed texts *The Wizard of the Emerald City* belongs. As I mentioned in Chapter I, some scholars use slash or hyphen in order to apply more than one category to Volkov's version of Baum's tale. Mitrokhina calls Volkov a "Soviet interpreter/plagiarist" (187). Lomaka uses the term "author-translator" (32). Inggs refers to him as a "writer-translator" (79). According to the cover of Blystone's translation into English, *The Wizard of the Emerald City* is a "Russian translation/adaptation". Such mixed references are unusual, considering that there is a vast difference between translation and adaptation, or between being interpreter, translator, plagiarist, and author. Nevertheless, each of these terms is applicable to a certain extent to the case of Volkov.

Differing views depend on interpretation of how, and why, Volkov has deviated

from the source text. The motivation behind his revision of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* is significant, albeit controversial, in this context. It is also necessary to note that the case of Volkov is remarkable due to many other factors, one of which is the fact that *The Wizard of the Emerald City* has been translated into thirteen languages, including English. To use the words of Nesbet, “[i]n the ordinary course of events, it is rare to find a translator crowing over the large number of languages into which his translation has been further translated” (80). Nesbet’s statement implies that Volkov is a translator. Thereupon, in spite of macro-level alterations incorporated by him, *The Wizard of the Emerald City* is no more than a translation of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. This stance is congruent with Shavit’s remarks regarding the peripheral position of children’s literature.

One of Shavit’s arguments is that the children’s literature translators are permitted to freely manipulate the text in order to adjust it to two principles, which dominate this literary stratum. Following this line of thought, the deforming tendencies implemented by Volkov can be interpreted as a, more or less, normative behaviour of a translator of children’s literature. In this light then, *The Wizard of the Emerald City* can be perceived as a translation rather than an adaptation. The only thing that does not cohere with this theory is the fact that Volkov puts his own name on the cover, misappropriating Baum’s work. Yet, this is explicable. In fact, both Lomaka and Inggs argue that such an approach was not uncommon during the Soviet era. To quote Lomaka:

It might seem unusual, given contemporary perspectives on piracy and plagiarism, that Volkov published a book he only slightly reworked under his own name. Soviet translation practices, however, tended towards adaptation rather than literal rendering. (Lomaka 19-20)

Inggs expresses a similar idea in a following manner:

In a tradition of loose translation and rewriting, reinforced by institutionalised censorship, it was perfectly acceptable to appropriate “first texts” and make them into secondary “first texts” in the target language and literary system. This process was even more acceptable in the context of children’s literature, often deemed to have a lower status than so-called serious adult fiction. (Inggs 88)

Thus, taking into consideration the peripheral position of children’s literature in general, and the historical background of *The Wizard of the Emerald City* in particular, it can be referred to as a translation indeed. Here, I would like to clarify that although Soviet translation practices tended towards adaptation, not all the translators claimed to be authors. For instance, Z. M. Zadunajskaja and A. I. Ljubarskaja published their retelling of *The Wonderful Adventures of Nils* under the name of its author, Selma Lagerlöf. In contrast to Volkov, they did not claim to be creators of the tale in spite of reworking it greatly by cutting all the didactic parts and many storylines.

If so, should *The Wizard of the Emerald City* be treated as a form of translation despite the fact that Volkov claims the authorship instead of remaining an invisible storyteller⁵⁸ like the rest of his colleagues? What differentiates translated children’s literature from an adaptation, parody or plagiarism if all of these text transformations are characterized by a free reworking of the narrative?

As far as the definition of “translation” is concerned, Theo Hermans writes that it “should be both inclusive and exclusive ... should account for all the individual tokens under its purview but demarcate a borderline shutting out everything else” (75). One of the challenges of situating Volkov’s retelling within the mentioned above conceptual categories is the lack of a demarcating borderline. His version of Baum’s tale is reflective

⁵⁸ A reference to the book *The Role of Translators in Children’s Literature: Invisible Storytellers* written by Gillian Lathey in 2010.

of characteristics of not only translation, but also adaptation, appropriation and plagiarism. The equivalent of the resulting hybrid of qualities is evident in the fusion of conceptual terms used by various scholars in a futile attempt to define Volkov's version of Baum's tale. Presented above examples of the use of mixed references are as controversial as speculations about Volkov's motivation behind rewriting *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*.

The words of Toury from the introduction of my thesis are applicable in this context. According to him, translator's method can be affected by numerous factors, and as a result, his or her motivation may vary from decision to decision. Toury argues that the extent of consistency and systematicity of the translator's behaviour "should emerge at the end of a study as one of its conclusions, rather than being presupposed" (67). On the one hand, the suggestion that Volkov's approach has been affected by his historical environment is fairly reasonable. On the other hand, building one's study on a preconceived notion that every alteration made by him is a product of a sole objective is misguided.

The findings of both Mitrokhina and Inggs are compromised because of their one-dimensional reading with a concentration in ideology and censorship respectively. Perhaps it is not a coincidence that both of them neglect to acknowledge the discrepancy between two editions of *The Wizard of the Emerald City*. Whether it is indicative of their ignorance or a deliberate disregard, it is beneficial for their arguments. As Kanzler notes, instead of being objective, Mitrokhina "uses her reading of Volkov to harshly criticize the politics of Soviet children's literature" (94). Consequently, instead of being an object of her study, *The Wizard of the Emerald City* turns into a means to an end. Mitrokhina

interprets every modification incorporated by Volkov as an indication of his Soviet ideological agenda. However, most of the examples supplementing her argument are absent from the first edition of *The Wizard of the Emerald City*. While it is possible, in theory, that it takes Volkov two decades to become a so-called transmitter of Soviet ideology, it is improbable. The main consistency in Volkov's method that emerges at the end of my study is a logical rather than ideological consistency. The rest of the objectives appear to be secondary.

Works Cited:

- Askey, Jennifer. "Oz in Germany: Alexander Volkov's Der Zauberer der Smaragdenstadt." *The Lion and the Unicorn* 36.3 (2012): 258-73. Project MUSE.
- Baum, Frank L. *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. London: Penguin Books, 1995. Print.
- Ben-Ari, Nitsa. "An Open System of Systems". *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies*. Eds. Millán, Carmen, and Francesca Bartrina. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis, 2013. 144-150. eBook Collection (EBSCOhost)
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. "Polysystem Theory." *Literature, Interpretation, Communication*. Spec. issue of *Poetics Today*, 1.1/2 (1979): 287-310. *JSTOR Journals*.
- Galkina, T. V. *Neznakomyj Aleksandr Volkov v vospominanijah, pis'mah i dokumentah* [*The unknown Aleksandr Volkov in memoirs, letters and documents*]. Tomsk: Izdatel'stvo Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta, 2006. Print.
- Gauthier, Tammi A. "Fun & Profit: When Commercial Parodies Constitute Copyright or Trademark Infringement." *Pepperdine Law Review* 21.1, article 5 (1993): 165-205. *HeinOnline Law Journal Library*.
- Gillespie, David and Neil Cornwell. "Chapter 19: Thaws, Freezes and Wakes: Russian Literature, 1953-1991." *Routledge Companion to Russian Literature* (2001): 223-233. *Literary Reference Center*.
- Hermans, Theo. "What Is (Not) Translation?" *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies*. Eds. Millán, Carmen, and Francesca Bartrina. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis, 2013. 75-87. eBook Collection (EBSCOhost)
- Hughenoltz, P. Bernt. "Chronicle of the Netherlands Dutch copyright law, 2001-2010".

(<http://www.ivir.nl/publicaties/download/917>) 22 Dec. 2014.

Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York: Routledge, 2013. Print.

Inggs, Judith A. "Censorship and Translated Children's Literature in the Soviet Union: The Example of the Wizards Oz and Goodwin." *Target* 23.1 (2011): 77-91. *Communication & Mass Media Complete*.

Kanzler, Katja. "Kansas, Oz, and the Magic Land: A Wizard's Travels through the Iron Curtain." *Ambivalent Americanizations: Popular and Consumer Culture in Central and Eastern Europe*. Ed. Sebastian Hermann et al. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag, 2008. 89-104. Print.

Karjala, Dennis S. "Harry Potter, Tanya Grotter, and the Copyright Derivative Work." *Arizona State Law Journal* 38.17 (2006): 17-40. *HeinOnline Law Journal Library*.

Kitch, Edmund W. "Comment on Dennis S. Karjala, Harry Potter, Tanya Grotter, and the Copyright Derivative Work." *Arizona State Law Journal* 38.41 (2006): 41-6. *HeinOnline Law Journal Library*.

Lomaka, Maria. "Totoshka, We're Not In Kansas Anymore: Translating American-Soviet Cold War Tension Through *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*". Undergraduate Senior Thesis. Columbia University, 2013. Web.

Mitrokhina, Xenia. "The Land of Oz in the Land of the Soviets." *Children's Literature Association Quarterly* 21.4 (1996-7):183-88 . *Project MUSE*.

Nesbet, Anne. "In Borrowed Balloons: The Wizard of Oz and the History of Soviet Aviation." *The Slavic and East European Journal* 45.1 (2001): 80-95. *JSTOR Journals*.

Nikolajeva, Maria. "Russian Children's Literature Before and After Perestroika."

Children's Literature Association Quarterly 20.3 (1995):105-11. *Project MUSE*.

Raw, Lawrence, ed. *Translation, Adaptation and Transformation*. London: Continuum, 2012. Print.

Shavit, Zohar. "Translation of Children's Literature." *Poetics of Children's Literature*.

Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1986. 111-130. Web.

Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies-- And Beyond*. Amsterdam: John

Benjamins Pub. Co, 1995. eBook Academic Collection (EBSCOhost).

Volkov, Alexander Melentyevich. *Skazochnie Povesti*. Moscow: Ripol, 1992. Print.

Volkov, Alexander Melentyevich. *The Wizard of the Emerald City*. Trans. Peter

Blystone. New York: Red Branch, 1991. Print.