Важным вопросом, решаемым в паремиологии русского народа, является определение ценностей человеческой жизни, что нашло отражение в пословицах: *У его хозяйки балакирь без вести пропал* (т.е. 'зарыт тайком с деньгами'); *Денег нет — перед прибылью — лишний грош перед гибелью*; *Ростовщики на том свете калёные пятаки голыми руками считают*.

Таким образом, мы видим, что с одной стороны, деньги - сила, с другой - они обретают власть и над теми, кто ими владеет, то есть это корень многих бед и разновидность рабства. Деньги сродни мудрости, в то же время большое богатство глухо к доводам рассудка. Деньги и добродетель не всегда уживаются вместе. А в русском пословично-поговорочном фонде концепт «деньги» способствует не только выражению чувств, реакций, проявлению эмоциональной жизни человека в целом, но и формирует ценностную картину мира, поскольку даёт оценку предметов по этическим и эстетическим нормам данного языкового коллектива, квалифицирует определённые свойства и проявления личности, соотнося их как с положительной, так и с отрицательной оценкой, и принадлежит выразительному фонду языка, который противостоит номинативному.

В английском и русском языках выражена мысль о том, что деньги сами по себе не могут принести внутренний покой, счастье и удовлетворение. Однако и в бедности человек не может найти довольства, радости и смысла жизни. Мудрость подсказывает, что решение этой дилеммы, с которой столь часто сталкивается человек, состоит в стремлении стать такой личностью, которая уважаема сама по себе и в то же время притягивает к себе деньги, поскольку истинное богатство состоит в наличии целого комплекса условий, включающих в себя и здоровье, и финансовое благополучие, и целеустремленность, и трудолюбие, и усердие, и знание, и нравственность, и добросердечие, и веру, и любовь, и внутренний покой, и духовность. Однако в менталитете каждого народа определяется и разное содержание одного и того же понятия «деньги», благодаря чему картина мира приобретает национально-специфическую окраску, как в плане выражения, так и в плане содержания. Мы полагаем, что национально специфическое содержание концепта «деньги» обусловлено различным опытом познания действительности и особенностями оценочной деятельности того или иного народа.

1. Даль В.И. Пословицы русского народа. М.: ОЛМА - ПРЕСС, 2000г.
2. Кузьмин С.С., Шадрин И.Л. Русско-английский словарь пословиц и поговорок. — СПб., 1996.
3. Мюллер В.К. Англо-русский словарь. М.: Русский язык, 1988.
4. Райдаут Р., Уиттинг К. Толковый словарь английских пословиц. СПб., 1997.

Ryabko Y.I.

Hermeneutical method as the analysis of a literary text and its translations

*Pacific State University
(Russia, Khabarovsk)*

doi: 10.18411/spc-26-05-2020-09

idsp: sciencepublic-26-05-2020-09

Today literary translation is no longer treated as a mere linguistic phenomenon as it involves linguistic as well as cultural processes. Literary translation is the harmonious interaction of the two languages, literatures and cultures. The translator's actions are determined not only by *language* and speech styles, *stylistic norms etc.*, they are also regulated by the rules and concepts of the source and target cultures, the standards of literary communication, the vision and understanding of a literary work, personal skills and preferences of its translator. The analysis of the systems of meanings that fill the source and

the target texts is based on the mechanisms of understanding and interpretation. That enables the researcher to choose *hermeneutical* approach to study them.

In the modern science hermeneutics is defined equivocally. Hermeneutics is derived from the Greek word *hermeneuein* that means to utter, explain, clarify, interpret, decipher, reveal, translate. The word etymology says that hermeneutics is used in case of misunderstanding. If the meaning of the object of the study is hidden from its researcher, it should be deciphered, understood and grasped [Soboleva, 2013].

The interaction of philosophical hermeneutics and linguistics gave rise to the appearance of linguistic hermeneutics. The terms «philological hermeneutics», «linguistic hermeneutics», «intercultural hermeneutics», «*hermeneutical* approach in *translation studies*» used in the research works of modern scientists prove the fact. There are the questions how to distinguish linguistic hermeneutics from philosophical one and how to use hermeneutical method for literary text analysis and its translations.

The object of study of linguistic hermeneutics is text communication as a sign system that is the communication with a text and by means of the text. Any text communication includes the two interacted levels – the linguistic level (as a text does not exist aside a language) and the hermeneutical level (it requires the processes of understanding and interpretation) [Buzuk, 2016].

According to a Russian scholar Kamchatnov, a text is a multidimensional phenomenon and can be interpreted from the theological, philosophical, historical, esthetic points of view. As the text is inseparable from the language, its interpretation is not possible without the linguistic component. The aim of the linguistic hermeneutics is to identify this component. Its task is not merely to describe linguistic facts but to interpret them in close connection with the text and to interpret the text in close connection with its linguistic environment [Kamchatnov, 1995].

Linguistic hermeneutics is characterized by the absence of a set number of methods. It mostly uses the methods of philosophy: the methods of understanding, interpretation, hermeneutical circle, contextual analysis, the congeniality principle. It also enriches its methodology by methods of other sciences.

Translational hermeneutics studies the mechanisms of translator's understanding of the source text and the tools of its interpretation in the target text. This direction is being developed in the research works of N. Garbovskiy, M. Moiseyev, N. Serkova, Yu. Obolenskaya, Ye. Morozkina and others. Hermeneutical methods allow to view literary translation and some of its problems in a new way. Translation is described as a hermeneutic process, a complex interpreting system, the systematic activity, which is able to interpret the signs of one semiotic system by means of the signs of another semiotic system. A translator does not translate words; he conveys the systems of meanings, which appear from the combination of individual signs [Garbovskiy, 2004].

The hermeneutical model for literary translation analysis can be presented as the algorithm that consists of the following stages:

The first stage forms the prejudgment of the plot of the source text. The researcher gathers extra linguistic information – the facts about the epoch and the author of the literary work, the story of its creation and publication, its literary value, the peculiarities of its literary world, the information about its translator/translators, the time when translations appeared, etc. The second stage is the hermeneutical interpretation level of the original through empathy, understanding, contextual analysis and personal horizon. The next stage is the analysis of the process of meaning transformation from the source text into the target text. Due to the interlanguage and intercultural asymmetry, which occurs between units of two different languages in the literary translation there are shifts of meanings, losses and gains.

Mikhail Bulgakov became famous in Russia as well as in the whole world thanks to his main piece of work – the novel «The Master and Margarita». The piece of work contains M. Bulgakov's views on many issues: those contemporary to the writer's epoch as well as

those possessing eternal value. Due to the fact, the novel will never be forgotten, it will raise arguments and disputes. It will ask the reader numerous questions whose answers cannot be found immediately but only with the passing time, experience and self-cognition. Every generation of readers will reveal new meanings of it, without coming to the final unambiguous interpretation. A large number of research papers and six variants of the novel translation into English confirm this idea.

Pontius Pilate is one of the key characters of the novel and one of the most complicated ones. Let us analyze a short episode with the character, the way it is presented in the original and in the two English translations of «The Master and Margarita», made by Mirra Ginsburg (1967) and Hugh Aplin (2008).

Pontius Pilate was a Roman officer, the Procurator of the Roman province of Judea. Soldiers bring a beggar to him. According to the agents of the secret police, the beggar - Yeshua ha Notzri – encouraged people to destroy the Temple. The Gospels say that the high priests of the Jews could not condemn Jesus Christ without the agreement of the Procurator. That is why Christ was brought to Pilate. The Procurator found out that Jesus was from the Herodian area of Judea and sent him to Herod the Great who was in Jerusalem those days. Herod did not want to deal with the case and sent Jesus back to Pilate. The reference to this Biblical plot is in the following abstract:

«“Подследственный из Галилеи? К тетрарху дело посылали?” “Да, прокуратор”, – ответил секретарь. “Что же он?” “Он отказался дать заключение по делу и смертный приговор Синедриона направил на ваше утверждение...”» [Bulgakov, 1994].

M. Ginsburg translates the abstract as following: *«“The accused is from Galilee? Was the case sent to the Tetrarch?” “Yes, Procurator,” replied the secretary. “What did he say?” “He refused to give a decision in the case and ordered that the Sanhedrin’s death sentence be submitted to you for confirmation...”»* [Bulgakov, 1967].

Hugh Aplin’s variant: *«“The man under investigation is from Galilee, is he? Was the case sent to the Tetrarch?” “Yes, Procurator,” replied the secretary. “And he did what?” “He refused to give a decision on the case and sent the Sanhedrin’s death sentence for your ratification...”»* [Bulgakov, 2008].

M. Ginsburg’s Pilate calls Yeshua «the accused» that is a person who has already been charged with a crime, there is evidence that he/she had committed the crime. So, in this variant Yeshua is already guilty for the Procurator, the coming interrogation is just a little formality. Pontius Pilate, who is suffering from a splitting headache, has an intention to go through this formality as fast as possible, sentence the accused to death and leave for his rooms.

In H. Aplin’s translation Pilate treats Yeshua as «the man under investigation», in other words as a person who is being investigated, whose guilt has not been found yet. The word combination does not express directly the idea that the character is guilty. In this variant the Procurator intends to interrogate the beggar to find out whether he is really at fault. The meaning created by the translator may remind a reader the organization of the judiciary in the modern society: a person is innocent until proven guilty.

Pilate’s secretary says that the death sentence is sent to the Procurator «for confirmation» (M. Ginsburg) / «for ratification» (H. Aplin). M. Ginsburg’s equivalent is defined as an announcement or proof that something is true or certain [Cambridge Dictionary]. The word «confirmation» can be used as a law term – the confirmation of the sentence by an authority or official. That is exactly what the Procurator supposed to do in this situation. H. Aplin’s choice «ratification» is a more modern word although it is less appropriate for the context in our opinion. Being the act of voting on a decision or signing a written agreement to make it official (law, politics) [Cambridge Dictionary], the term is used when it is necessary to validate an important paper such as the international agreement or something like that. It obviously does not correspond to the plot of the story.

Thus, in H. Aplin's translation the Roman Procurator appears to be more modern. The translator emphasizes the professional features of the character. Pontius Pilate possesses the traits of the modern politician and lawyer, acts in accordance with the situation.

Hermeneutics as the methodology of interpretation can provide guidance for solving problems of interpretation of literary source texts and translated texts. It enables a reader, a translator, a researcher to achieve an in-depth understanding of meanings of works of art and texts.

1. Bulgakov, M.: *Master i Margarita* [The Master and Margarita], Simferopol, Tavriya, 404 p. (1994).
 2. Bulgakov, M.: *The Master and Margarita* // Translated from the Russian by Mirra Ginsburg. New York: Grove Press, 402 p. (1967).
 3. Bulgakov, M.: *The Master and Margarita* // Translated from the Russian by Hugh Aplin. Alma Classics Ltd, 432 p. (2008).
 4. Buzuk, L.G.: *Lingvisticheskaya germenevtika: v poiskah metodologicheskikh osnovaniy* [Linguistic hermeneutics: in the search of methods]. Tambov, Gramota Publ., no. 8 (62): Part 2, pp. 59-62 (2016).
 5. Cambridge Dictionary [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/ru>, last accessed 2020/02/05.
 6. Garbovskiy, N.K.: *Teoriya perevoda* [Translation theory]. Moscow, Moscow St. Univ. Publ., 544 p. (2004).
 7. Kamchatnov, A.M.: *Lingvisticheskaya germenevtika (na material drevnerusskikh rukopisnykh istochnikov)* [Linguistic hermeneutics (on materials of ancient Russian sources)]. Moscow, Prometey Publ., 166 p. (1995).
 8. Soboleva, M.Y.: *Filosofskaya germenevtika: ponyatia i positsii* [Philosophical hermeneutics: categories and views]. Moscow, Academic Project Publ., 151 p. (2013).
-