

## CULTURAL INTERPRETATION OF ETHNIC ARCHETYPES

A. R. Borova, K. K. Bauaev\*, A. Kh. Musukaeva, K. T. Timizhev, N. B. Bozieva, M. Kh. Khulchaeva

Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education «Kabardino-Balkarian State University named after H.M. Berbekov»

Published online: 1 February 2018

---

### ABSTRACT

The relevance of the study is due to the current state of the theory and practice of translation (both in Russia and throughout the world) which does not consider non-contextual ethnic content of the basic levels – from appeals to national recreational practices to cultural archetypes and patterns. The aim of the present study is to analyze the translations of the Kabardian poet from the point of view of substrate information preserved in foreign texts. The leading approach studying the semantics of ethnic institutional archetypes and considering specific examples which prove that the cross-cutting motives of national Kabardian thinking (formed on the basis of specific ethical standards and ideals of the people) are not taken into account in translations. The main conclusion of the authors' is that the adequacy of foreign language interpretations of poetic works should be based not only on detailed paraphrase, but, first and foremost, on a thorough study of the life practices of the ethnos, especially those that directly formed the behavioral norms of the people in the past and continue to maintain their relevance today. The materials of the article can be useful when working on translations of poetic texts of the peoples of the North Caucasus.

**Keywords:** translation, North Caucasian literature, Kabardian poetry, authenticity, national image of the world, barbarism, cultural interpretation, reflection, associativity, idiomatics, transitivity.

---

Author Correspondence, e-mail: [kazim\\_bauaev@mail.ru](mailto:kazim_bauaev@mail.ru)

doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/jfas.v10i2s.48>



## INTRODUCTION

The cultural interpretation of the poetic works of the North Caucasus, despite a whole constellation of brightest and highly professional translators whose work was closely connected with the region in the 60s and 70s of the last century, leaves many questions open. Naturally, the main one is the semantic completeness and accuracy of the renderings, although there is no doubt in the aesthetic and artistic consistency of the texts by N. Grebnev, S. Lipkin, I. Kozlovsky [28], and other masters of the Soviet translation school.

The practice of poetic translation in the Soviet era remained within the boundaries of pre-revolutionary approaches and bore the imprint of the originality of Russian interpretation techniques oriented at the free translation of the text. Their essence is best expressed by Zhukovsky's well-known formula: "A translator in prose is a slave; the translator in verse is a rival" [10: 833]. It is necessary to take into account that the Russian literary thought was one of the first to form the realization that the artistic text in translation should preserve its ethnic specifics. Russian authors (until the end of the first quarter of the 19th century) considered themselves as elements of a peripheral cultural system and could not leave aside the issues of national identity and authenticity of works. A.S. Pushkin was one of the first not only in Russia but also in Europe to record and greet the departure from the 'correctional translation', rightly believing that the aesthetic significance of a literary text largely depends on the preservation of its 'own kind' and 'folk attire' [22: 137].

This question could not but worry the Russian authors, as in their understanding the fate of the national culture since the time of Peter I and Catherine II did not have clear prospects, and this circumstance was felt quite relevant by G.R. Derzhavin [9] already. Moreover, the preservation and development of Russian literature in its authentic forms was understood by the authors as the early creation of fundamental mechanisms for the integration of the ethnic aesthetic space into the European space. Therefore, the national content of the poetic work was seen by Russian authors in style and in the presentation of original forms of national prototypes. In any case, the definition of A.S. Pushkin – "this strange rhetorical expression" [23: 216] (by which he characterized the stable figures of the Quran, clearly going back to the immediate life experience of the Arabs) – in this sense is quite unambiguous and eloquent. Pushkin was not concerned with transferring recreational, archetypal information of these expressions; he was interested in their exoticism and the possibilities of cultural marking of the text, and, most importantly, the acceptability and accessibility of the actual information contained in them for the Russian or, in a wider sense, European reader. It was about creating a wide range of poetic representation and expression, compatible with European counterparts.

The selection and formation of the poetic language units under significant influence of another culture was not an act of inspiration. For instance, A.S. Pushkin, clearly understanding the insufficiency of certain information sectors, calls for their purposeful replenishment with Russian autologic lexemes in the context of the conceptual apparatus of the French language: "Someday one must say aloud that the Russian metaphysical language is still in a wild state". Pushkin is extremely clear about translations from French, accepting as a desirable norm the situation when "Gallicisms, syntactic or material, so to speak, are excluded" and "speculative concept Gallicisms are allowed, since they are Europeanisms"[6: 239].

Speaking of 'syntactic' gallicisms Pushkin actually meant the lexemes used in everyday speech, which had semantic recipients in the actual environment. In general, the attitude of the great Russian poet to conceptual structures is most clearly expressed not by him: in the first decades of the XIX century the actual evolutionary requirements of the national speech forced writers to reconsider their views on the harmfulness and utility of barbarisms more than once. Only the time distance allowed abstracting from random fluctuations of Russian social thought on this question and to expressing a more or less integral opinion: "... The struggle against the mechanical assimilation of the peculiarities of French semantics did not lead to, as an inevitable consequence, the denial of the structural forms of French speech itself. ... In ... the stylistic organization of the French literary language, according to Pushkin, lie the reasons for its strength and weakness. The power was in transparency and accuracy of expressions, and in the developed system of abstract concepts" [6: 239].

In the end, already within the boundaries of the Russian classical literary tradition, the system of adequate translation of artistic texts into European (and any other) languages was completely formed. However, in general, the lower information horizon of this system did not extend further than the denotative levels of apperception. The semantics of deeper levels of archetypal, spatial, temporal, and recreational representations remained outside the interpreter's perception, which, in fact, determines the methodology of the research in this article.

## **METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK**

The methodological basis of the research goes back not so much to literary theories and doctrines as to the positions of history, philosophy, sociology, ethnography and psychology, formulated in the writings of M. Foucault, K. Jung, M. Heidegger, A. Längle, T. Parsons, R. Dawkins, K. Jaspers and some other scientists and philosophers. The basis of our approach is

the analysis of the poetic text, taking into account its stable information structures and models of their interaction, the genesis and formation of which occur in the collective national consciousness – archetypes, cultural memes, emblems and symbols, and moral imperatives. Schemes for parsing the substrate information of the texts are either original authors' developments or are drawn from a number of special studies: 'Family, socialization and interaction process' [37], 'Person. Existential-analytic theory of personality' [21], 'The selfish gene'[35], 'Being and time' [29], 'Archetype and symbol' [33], 'Words and things. Archeology of the Humanities' [36], Language // Philosophy of Language and Semiotics' [34].

## **DISCUSSIONS**

The theory and practice of translation is a long-standing object of interest for literary critics, poets, and prose writers. As already mentioned, a serious interest in this subject was shown by A.S. Pushkin who, in fact, laid the foundations of the modern understanding of the translation functions and content. However, with the emergence of a new literatures community of the USSR peoples it turned out that the methods, ontology and tools of the traditional 'Russian' translation are not fully functional when it comes to translating the artistic texts of authors belonging to the so-called 'newly written' literary systems. There was a situation when the comprehension of theoretical questions lagged far behind true practice. This happened primarily because the conscience of the authors, for example, of the North Caucasus, fully preserved the information content which relates not only to the ritual class etiquette and narrowly specialized norms of military morality, but was uniquely affiliated with the space of myth and national epic. The Soviet translation school was mainly interested in the 'technology' of the inter-language transposition, adapted to the existing system. Priority was given to those areas of scientific search that attributed the moments of the commutation community of different cultures and languages. Therefore, even in spite of very profound and subtle works on the peculiarities of the lexical [31: 129-142], syntactic [31], even grammatical [25] translation of texts, and of generalizing complex works [28] the questions of cultural interpretation of the semantic components of those works the transitivity of which caused doubt remained outside the zone of scientific interest. This attempt to analyze the nature of the substrate information in A. Keshokov's poems is one of the first examples of such study, and in respect of the works of the North Caucasus authors, in particular, the Kabardian (Adyghe) authors it is undoubtedly the first.

For a long time, the situation with the translations of North Caucasus poets was determined by the fact that, although for ‘new’ literatures the path to semantic correspondences to the Russian apperceptive field began in the 1930s, the residual influence of the tradition established in the 19th century made the sphere of denotative poetic representation the preferred sector for translation; more precisely, this sphere is the field of ‘common’ symbolic and poetic expressions built not even by national poets but by Russian authors throughout the XIX-XX centuries. The works where imagery was originally based on aesthetic universals of this type retain to the greatest extent their semantics in Russian and English versions:

Пока живём – на земле (не должна) пропасть честь.	Живёт человек в мире словом и хлебом
Тот, чьи стихи доходят до сердца, имеет право на свое слово.	И должен от праздного гула вдали Поэт обладать независимым небом,
Кто сеет нам хлеб – не (должен быть) лишен своей пашни,	А пахарь – хоть малым наделом земли.
(Он) зерно выбирает и отдает тем, у кого его нет.	Коль слово древней остального на свете,
У того, кто делает добро, всегда много чести.	И хлеб вековечен под жёлтой луной,
Тот, чьей душой овладело лишнее (неправедное),	Любой землепашец пред полем в ответе,
будет наказан за свою несправедливость.	Любой стихотворец – пред целой страной [17:285].
Если тебе досталась пашня – будь верен вспаханной тобой земле.	
Если поэт имеет право на слово, на него надеется его земля (родина) [15:397]	<i>Translation by Ya.Kozlovsky</i>

*Russian metaphor*

While we live, honor should not be lost on earth.	Man lives in the world by word and
The one whose poems reach the heart,	bread,
has the right to his own word.	And away from the idle hum
Who sows bread for us is not (should not be)	A poet should possess independent sky,
deprived	A plowman (should possess) a plot of
of his plowed land,	land, however small.

(He) chooses the grain and gives it to those who do  
not have it.

The one who does good always has a lot of honor.

The one whose soul was overpowered by

something unwanted (unrighteous)

will be punished for his injustice.

If you have plowed land –

be true to the land you plow.

If a poet has the right to speak,

his homeland (motherland) has hopes in him.

*word-for-word translation of the Russian*

*metaphase*

If the word is more ancient than the rest  
of the world,

And the bread is eternal under the  
yellow moon,

Any farmer answers to his field,

Any poet (answers) to the whole

country.

*word-for-word translation of*

*Kozlovsky's version*

Except for ideologically conditioned changes in certain semantic nuances of the poem and the withdrawal of two lines of the second stanza, Ya. Kozlovsky in this translation almost completely preserved the semantics and modality of the original. However, given some religious and mystical connotation of these cut-off lines, their removal can also be explained by the pressure of extra-literary factors. The English version of the work is also highly adequate:

Man's world is one of words and bread.

The poet, shunning idle mirth,

Needs boundless heaven overhead.

The ploughman needs a plot of earth.

Mankind's most ancient skill is speech

And bread is ever in demand.

The ploughman answers to his field,

The poet – to his native land.

*Translation by W. May*

The only conceptually significant difference between the Kabardian prototype and the translations is that Keshokov does not feel the status difference between a farmer and a poet, while Y. Kozlovsky and W. May emphasize the social position of the poet, the extent of his responsibility.

In the overwhelming majority of his works A. Keshokov did not confine himself to the conditional poetic idiom of the mediator type, and the presence in his texts of ethnic archetypes immediately raises the question of the meaningful correspondence of translations to the originals. At the same time, no comments of this kind regarding Russian language and English language interpretations are observed. The English translations of Keshokov are absolutely adequate in comparison with their Russian prototypes - the sets of objects mentioned indicate that the English versions of the poems of the Kabardian poet were written mainly from Russian translations: they do not coincide in any way with the originals and are very accurate in conveying the expressive structure of Russian translations:

The colour of joy has for ages been white,  
 Like the cherry-tree blossom in spring.  
 And the crests of Elbrus, and Kazbek's jagged height  
 Pure light, spotless white, to us bring.  
 The bell echoes over my dear native glade  
 To the swallows with flashing white breasts.  
 At the wedding the bride, all in white arrayed,  
 Is feasting among merry guests...[16:37]

*Translation by W.May*

– the literal translation of the English version shows its complete identity to the one by Ya. Kozlovsky:

Цвет радости во все века (эпохи) был белый, Как вишнёвый цвет весной. И гребень Эльбруса, и зубчатая вершина Казбека Чистый свет, безусловно белый, нам доставляют. Звуки колокольчика над дорогими родными полями – (В) Ласточке с белой сверкающей грудью. Выходящая замуж невеста, вся в белом одеянии,	Цвет радости белым считался от века, Как вещей черешневый цвет, С вершины Эльбруса и гребня Казбека Течёт незапятнанный свет. Звенит колокольчик над отчим пределом, У ласточки в белой груди, На свадьбе невеста пирует вся в белом Весёлых гостей посреди...[17:224]
--	--

*Translation by Ya.Kozlovsky*

Празднует среди весёлых гостей... [18:21]

*word-for-word Russian translation of May's  
version*

The color of joy was considered white for  
centuries,

As the prophetic cherry color,

From the top of Elbrus and the crest of  
Kazbek

A pure light flows.

The bell rings above the fatherland,

In the white breast of a swallow,

At the wedding, the bride is feasting all in  
white

Among the cheerful guests...

*word-for-word translation of Kozlovsky's  
version*

– and the same unquestionable difference with the original source. It can be rightly said that the similarity between the Kabardian (primary) version and the English final version is highly approximate, as the poem is hardly recognizable:

Идя навстречу счастливой радости,

Going towards happy joy,

Одевают белоснежную бурку.

One wears a snow-white burka.

Вот Эльбрус или Казбек

Here are Elbrus or Kazbek

Одеты в снежные бурки.

Dressed in snow burkas.

Если наступает самая темная ночь,

If the darkest night comes,

– Она не лишена белого сияния

- It is not devoid of the white light of a star, ..

звезды,..

(With white) one honors the rider,

(Белым) оказывают честь всаднику,

Who has mounted a horse.

Оседлавшему коня.

If the calico is not white.

Если ситец не будет белым.

The bride herself is unhappy,

Сама невеста недовольна,

With the coming of spring, no fields, no vegetable

С наступлением весны ни поля, ни

gardens

огороды Do not bloom without white  
 Не цветут без белого [18:21] *Word-for-word translation of the Russian*  
*Russian metaphor metaphor*

It is absolutely indisputable that the translation skills of Walter May in this case were lost. The consonance of ‘merry’ and ‘cherry’, exploited by the English poet, may bring something to the semantics of the white color proposed by Keshokov, but the very appearance of the flowering tree in the text is Kozlovsky’s explicit artistic arbitrariness. Moreover, the "bride who feasts among the guests" in the picture presented by the latter does not and cannot coincide in any of the emotive, ethical and aesthetic segments with the way Keshokov had in mind. In this sense, the English translation is more acceptable – the Adyghe bride in May’s understanding at least vaguely "celebrates among the guests" rather than "feasts". As said above, apparently, many translations of Keshokov into English are made from Russian texts. The overwhelming majority of them are full-fledged transpositions of these ‘secondary’ prototypes, demonstrating not just an exact adherence to the source, but even a more complete and aesthetically perfect disclosure of lyrical models built by Ya. Kozlovsky – the authors of the present study focused exclusively on the texts by this translator:

Two blades belonging to a single dagger Stand back to back. Together do they face, One enemy, one risk, a single danger, And share between them triumph and disgrace.	Два лезвия сливаются (длятся) в едином кинжале. Спина к спине. Вместе делая свой облик, Один враг (у них), один риск, единая опасность И доля меж ними – триумф или позор.
By those who knew the secrets of the trade, So custom ruled, alone the daggers made; A man might learn them only of his father And teach them to his son and to no other.	Лишь тем, кто знал тайны ремесла – По обычаю – единственный, кто делал кинжал; Мужчина мог узнать это у отца, И научить этому своего сына и никого другого.
The dagger’s code was not a slavish code; Its vow could not be broken, that is certain.	Закон кинжала – не закон раба;

And yet its blades might bear dark stains: Его обет не может быть нарушен, если он  
a curtain дан.  
Sealed off the past's remote and tortuous И еще его лезвия могут носить тёмное пятно:  
road. Клеймо давно пройденной и извилистой  
дороги.  
The dagger, when in time it was perfected,  
Helped men attain both good and evil Кинжал, оставшийся во времени  
goals, совершенным,  
And, used by lord and commoner, Помогал добиться божьей и дьявольской  
reflected цели,  
The base and lofty movements of the И, используемый бондом или общинником,  
soul... отражает

*Translation by W. May* Низкое или высокое движение души...  
[15:33]

*Word-for-word Russian translation of May's  
version*

Comparing May's text with Keshokov's original and the translation of Ya. Kozlovsky we see that the English translator, perhaps, was not even acquainted with the original source, and fully oriented towards the Russian version which he, undoubtedly, improved (completely preserving the semantics) despite the recognized skill of the Soviet poet:

У одного кинжала лезвия (два) не Два лезвия кинжала одного,  
одинаковы: Они спиной обращены друг к другу.  
Одно более острое, другое тупое, И меж собою делят оттого  
Но, что бы не совершил кинжал – Один позор или одну заслугу.  
Вина лежит одинаково на обоих  
лезвиях. Ковать кинжалы получал права  
Лишь тот, кто оружейником родился  
Мы переносим безграничные И посвящен был в тайну мастерства, –  
трудности: В горах обычай этот сохранился.  
Издавна кинжал делают  
Переживая не о свадьбах – Кинжалу дан характер не раба,

Мало ли у него нетерпеливых (владельцев)?  
 Обоих лезвий клятва нерушима,  
 Но кто заверит, что непогрешима  
 В веках кинжала тайная судьба?

Кому досталась рана от кинжала...  
 Думаешь, он заслуженно пролил кровь?  
 Тот, у кого безвременно погиб родственник,  
 Достигший совершенного обличья,  
 В руке простолюдина и паши  
 Он отражал душевное величье  
 Вот – до сих пор держит траур.  
 Иль низкое падение души.

Когда кинжал был у царя,  
 Честь не двулика. И не раз, бывало,  
 Он валил всех, кто попадался на глаза.  
 Кинжал надёжно защищал её.  
 Если упрямый натачивает кинжал,  
 Не потому ль два лезвия кинжала  
 Он не блестит – (так как владелец) Единое сливает остриё.  
 хочет плохого.

Два лезвия кинжала держатся друг за друга,  
 И я желаю более всего,  
 И счастье обоих одинаково.  
 Чтобы сливались истина и слово,  
 Как лезвия кинжала одного [17:222].

Если он (владелец) был умен и защищал добро,  
 Добро и для него собирают (даже) по крупицам.

*Translated by Ya.Kozlovsky*

Подобно двум лезвиям кинжала,  
 (Я не даю) не расходятся мои слова и чувства.  
 Я одариваю людей добром,  
 Я уделяю внимание человеческим мечтам [15:228].

*Russian metaphor*

One dagger's (two) blades are not the same:

Two blades of one dagger,  
 (They) are back to back.

One sharper, the other blunt,  
But, whatever the dagger did  
The fault lies equally on both blades.

We endure boundless difficulties:  
(They) have long been making the dagger  
Worrying not about weddings –  
Doesn't he have enough impatient  
owners?

Who got a dagger wound ...  
Do you think he deservedly shed blood?  
The one who had a relative died  
prematurely,  
Look, is still in mourning.

When the dagger was in a king's hands,  
He felled everyone who came to his eyes.  
If a stubborn one sharpens a dagger,  
It does not shine – (since the owner) bodes  
ill.

Two blades of a dagger hold on to each  
other,  
And the happiness of both is the same.  
If he (the owner) was clever and protected  
good,  
Good for him is collected (even) bit by bit.

Like two blades of a dagger,  
(I do not give) my words and feelings do  
not diverge.  
I give people good,

And between them they share  
One shame or one merit.

Received the rights to forge daggers  
Only the one who was born an armourer  
And he was given the secret of skill, –  
In the mountains this custom is preserved.

The dagger's character is not that of a slave,  
Both blades' vow is indestructible,  
But who will assure that infallible  
Is the secret of fate on the dagger's life?

Reaching the perfect guise  
In the hand of a commoner or of a pasha  
It reflected the spiritual greatness  
Or the low fall of the soul.

Honor is not two-faced. And more than once, it  
used to happen,  
The dagger defended it reliably.  
Is it not (the reason) the two blades of a dagger  
Are merged into one blade?

The cold steel flickers severely,  
And I wish more than anything,  
For the truth and the word to merge,  
Like the blades of one dagger.

*Word-for-word translation of Kozlovsky's  
version*

I pay attention to human dreams

*Word-for-word translation of the Russian  
metaphrase*

Kozlovsky's translation, who was, so to speak, the main Russian author working with A. Keshokov's texts, demonstrates a type of free, artistic interpretation. Yet, being quite acceptable to the reader who does not know the semantics of the prototype work, he basically presents us a poem based on 'The Dagger', which does not take into account the lyric chronotope of the Kabardian poet.

The evolutionary and creative imperative of Keshokov's poetry at all stages is the desire for reflection, localized in a clearly defined virtual space, in the midst of a reliable illusion of such space. When the necessary level of writing skills is reached, he even prefers a continuum that has characteristics of physical reality outside the expressed topological constructions. The natural expression of this type of apperception is a 'material', 'materialized' description of objects.

As stated above, Ya. Kozlovsky was able to convey the sensory fullness of the dagger; however, already in the second stanza he goes into the sphere of moral and ethical stating of the object and introduces (for reasons that seem incomprehensible at first glance) into the work the 'armourer by birth', 'the custom of making a dagger' and 'the secret of skill', non-existent in the original.

The difficulties of perceiving and creating a coherent sequence of perceptual pictures begin from the first submission of a dagger by Kozlovsky as an isolated object saturated with external associative. He sets the shape of a dagger, but this is the visible incarnation of a blade-symbol, not actualized in reality. Therefore, the translation is built on the further influx of denoters, poetic idiomatics and universals of conceptual quality.

Meanwhile, the only reason for these semantic deviations is the misunderstanding of the first stanza. The Russian translator was guided by daggers, propagated in the front zone, at best representing generalized isolated objects, all the semantics of which are localized in the zone of cultural universal meanings. Keshokov's same dagger, fashioned in this poem, is completely real – in the first stanza the poet not only points out the particular detail of its external appearance [14], but sets the temporary and social environment for the 'dagger', and their definiteness inevitably leads the object out of the sphere of conditional expressions.

"One dagger's (two) blades are not the same // One sharper / other blunt" is not an abstract poetic image. Keshokov talks about the so-called 'black dagger' (Adyghe: кѡама фыцѡ), whose owners in everyday life were mostly not Kabardian noble class but peasants. Being much bigger than the aristocratic kind, a black dagger was used not only in battles but also in housekeeping, and one side of it was not sharpened as carefully as the other used for combat one. Thus, Keshokov in one detail fully identifies the object in real ethnic time and space, and with one feature accurately describes its appearance – if the weapons of the noble class warriors could be very different in finish and size, black daggers were almost identical. Accordingly, for an ethnic reader, the mention of the difference in the sharpening of blades was equivalent to the direct description of a large horn handle, dark metal, leather sheath without silver trim, and so on.

Clearly, in this case one can talk about the actualization of the described object in various cultural and information fields – Keshokov's dagger is tied to the real environment of Kabardian national life, while Kozlovsky's blade is moved to the field of cultural associations. Such redeployment inevitably affects the nature of the perception of space: the national one has perceptual specifics, and the 'duplicated' one is completely conditional and does not have communicative quality; the objects of the translated text are related only to the denotative level of expression. From this point of view, the expression 'the blades belonging' by Walter May is much more informative and, at least, sets the parameters of the virtual continuum: the English poet's blades are not simply combined in a single blade – they 'last' in it, they merge longitudinally, creating visible form and linear extent.

Another example demonstrating the transfer of the description from the national lyric chronotope into a unified 'conditionally poetic':

Наш народ от своего слова не отступался	Слов на ветер предки не бросали,
И не привык к ружью перед очагом.	И не стреляли в облачную высь.
И если они (предки) вынимали свой голый	И, целуя синь калёной стали,
кинжал,	Перед боем словом не клялись.
– Горе тому, из-за кого они его вынимали.	
	И гласила надпись на кинжале,
Если они укорачивали стремяна,	Чтоб лихие помнили мужи:
То вступали в бой – слова их были коротки.	«Из ножен не вырви без печали,
Пришедшего гостя они сравнивали с богом	И без славы в ножны не вложи!»

И (провожая) показывали ему верный путь.

Подумай и скажи, если хочешь говорить,

И не садись, не осмотревшись –

На этих традициях воспитывали  
рождающихся детей,

И тот, кто был с эти не согласен – лишался  
слова.

Я много раз говорил лишние слова,

Но не считайте меня лгуном, –

В моих книгах стихов нет ни одного слова,

Не вышедшего из сердца [15:208].

*Russian metaphrase*

Our people did not take their words back  
And was not used to the gun in front of the  
hearth.

And if they (the ancestors) took out their naked  
dagger,

– Woe to the one because of whom they took it  
out.

If they shortened the stirrups,  
They entered into battle - their words were short.  
They compared the guest to God  
And (seeing off) showed him the right way.

Think and say, if you want to speak,  
And do not sit down, without looking around -  
On these traditions, children were raised,  
And the one who disagreed with them was  
deprived of the word.

Где дела не в слове были громки,

Речь взнуздать умели, как коня.

Впрямь за многословие потомки

Упрекнут когда-нибудь меня.

Не всегда придерживался правил

Тех я, что мятежный чтит Кавказ,

Но в стихах не лгал и не лукавил,

Плакавший над вымыслом не раз

[16:58].

*Translation by Ya.Kozlovsky*

Words were not thrown by the ancestors  
to the wind,

And they did not shoot at the cloudy  
height.

And, kissing the blue steel ,

Before the battle they did not swear by  
word.

And the inscription on the dagger read,  
So that the dashing would remember:  
"Do not draw (it) out without sorrow,  
And do not sheath (it) without glory!"

Where actions were loud not in words,  
(They) could bridle speech like a horse.  
Indeed the descendants for verbosity  
will reproach me someday.

<p>I have many times said superfluous words, But do not consider me a liar, - In my books of poetry there is not a single word, (Which wouldn't) come out of my heart.</p>	<p>I did not always follow the rules That the rebellious Caucasus revered, But I did not lie and cheat in verse, Crying over fiction more than once.</p>
<p><i>Word-for-word translation of the Russian metaphrase</i></p>	<p><i>Word-for-word translation of Kozlovsky's version</i></p>

– and the English version of the first stanzas with literal translation:

<p>Of words our ancestors were sparing. They would send no volleys up the skies. Kissing their daggers before warring, They would never utter boastful cries.</p> <p>They were true to the one inscription On hard steel that bore no speck of rust: “Do not leave your sheath without good reason, With glory back in it be thrust!”</p> <p><i>Translation by W.May</i></p>	<p>Слова наших предков были скудны. Они не посылали залпов вверх в небо. Целуя свои кинжалы перед битвой, Они никогда не издавали хвастливых криков.</p> <p>Они были верны одной надписи На суровой стали без пятнышка ржавчины: «Не покидай ножны без важной причины, И будь вложен в них со славой!» [16:59]</p> <p><i>Word-for-word Russian translation of May's version</i></p>
--	---

It is not difficult to see that Ya. Kozlovsky again finds himself lost among not so much ‘Caucasian’ but Russian ‘frontier’ poetic ideas, and being plunged into this cultural background from the first lines of his translation, he must further develop it by imposing on the reader an approximate ‘eastern’ world which is far enough from Keshokov’s presentations. The literal statement of the Kabardian author ‘if the ancestors took out their dagger // woe to the one because of whom they took it out’, reflected in the idiom of the people as an obligatory ethical and behavioral norm, Ya. Kozlovsky interprets with pathos completely alien to the Adyghe people.

Having followed this path, the translator is forced to continue to present to the reader a certain generalized image of the ‘Eastern’ knight, saturating the text with his own pictures far from the historical reality of the ethnos. The Circassians did not know such ceremonial actions as kissing the blade, and the behavior of warriors prior to battle was purely ‘technical’,

preparatory – oaths were unnecessary for them, since the disciplinary norms were extremely rigid a priori – the leader of the military campaign could execute any warrior, even if he belonged to the princely estate: "... Kabardians... elect the chief commander of the princes not according to the seniority of the clan but by personal courage and general trust... In the field he has the power to execute the disobedient to death without trial, though refrains from such rigor towards princes to avoid hostility and blood feud" [4: 121].

Then, "inscription on the dagger" appears in the translation. This detail is also alien to the national military norms – even the sayings from the Quran were not allowed on the Adyghe blades – the attitude towards the latter was so careful that only fullers were forged on them, as it was believed that any kinds of ornamentation and inscriptions reduce the strength of the weapon. E. Astvatsaturyan notes that the names of early Circassian craftsmanship makers are unknown – manufacturer brands appear on the blades only from the second half of the XIX century [1:27]; she also writes that Dagestan sabers and daggers were often decorated with lengthy sayings and even drawings.

Thus, another shift of the lyrical chronotope ‘to the east’ occurred. In the English translation this led to an indirect description of the predatory ritual inherent in the Celtic tribes: "They never issued boastful cries before the battle" – apparently, in the interpretation of Ya. Kozlovsky W. May saw something that reminded him of the norms of Western military behavior in their archaic (for an Englishman) specifics – the knights of Europe also did not kiss their blades since the Crusades. Briefly summarizing the comparative analysis of the Kabardian texts quoted by Keshokov and their Russian and English interpretations, it can be stated that the inability to interpret the works was due to the inability to express the peculiarities of the national archetype, recorded by the Kabardian poet in the form of concrete figurative details.

Here we speak about the deepest layers of consciousness, such as spatial thinking or the systematization of the reticular paintings. However, one cannot say the spatial characteristics of Keshokov’s works have ‘dropped out’ of Kozlovsky’s field of vision – in a lot of poems the Russian author clearly reproduces the continuum constructions of the Kabardian poet, right up to exact observance of the process-vector methods of forming the virtual universe. There is no need to list them in full, we just note that the principle of the ‘diagonal’ volume structure characteristic of Keshokov, as well as the peculiarities of his perception of space with the help of the direction of action, are given in some translations so emphatically that there is no doubt in Kozlovsky’s deep understanding of them. It will be fair to say that all the types of Keshokov’s spatial models are reflected in the translations of his poems. However, as

a rule, these are always attempts to fix the ‘physical’ continuum, without its cultural attribution – attempts to build a virtual space in which, without taking into account the ethnicity of the lyric ‘I’, experiences and actions are recorded:

Извечно звезды вестовые	Eternally the news-bringing stars
Глядят на доли и хребты,	Look at the valleys and ridges,
И, как рекламы световые,	And, as advertising lights,
Читают судьбы с высоты...[17:253]	Read fates from a height ...
– ‘Pyramidal’ space model;	

Мне слышен зов минувших дней,	I can hear the call of the past days,
Что молодой шумит листвою	That rustles the young foliage
И над седую голову	And over (my) gray head
Вдаль гонит облачных коней...[17:260]	drives the cloud horses into the distance...
– ‘Vector-process’ space model;	

...И люди в небо вглядываться стали,	... And people began to peer into the sky,
Услышав журавлей издалека.	Hearing the cranes from afar.
Стрелять по их клинообразной стае	To shoot at their wedge-shaped flock
У горца не поднимется рука...[17:270]	A mountaineer will not raise his hand...
– ‘Diagonal space model, and many more.	

*Word-for-word translation of Kozlovsky’s*

*Translation by Ya.Kozlovsky version*

However, the ethnic universe, this ethnically perceived space is absent from Russian and, correspondingly, English translations. Turning to the example of the national imagery that has been repeatedly cited, "if they shortened the stirrups", we note that the reason for its withdrawal from foreign versions was not simply ignorance of the rational essence of this combat trick of the Circassians, but also a lack of understanding of the topological position of the lyric hero. Ya. Kozlovsky simply had no feeling of that segment of the perceptual space which is set by the difference in the position of the rider sitting in the saddle and the rider who stood on the shortened stirrups to strike. This Circassian microcosm, outlined by physiological bodily sensations, could not be processed by the interpreter’s consciousness.

It is the space of a concrete, historically and existentially real national existence, of its mentality and vital practices and recreational experience. As shown in a number of studies, the ethnic structurization of the continuum is directly determined not only by the surrounding landscape [27: 274], but also by economic methods [19: 109]. In Keshokov's works, it is expressed, as a rule, in poetic representations that carry the evolutionally changed but nevertheless absolutely recognizable features of ethnic cultural archetypes. It is necessary to understand that for the national reader the images that went back to the basic ethno-aesthetic dominants of the Kabardian epos carried all the semantics of the evolutionary path they traveled, including the inherent characteristics of space and time, the chronotopic volume in which these images were realized. For the foreign reader, however, the specific meaning of the details described, and, naturally, the continuum given by them remained unclear, and professional translators, even sensing the information potential of such expressions, altered them in a manner understandable to them:

Иногда небо голубое, на зеркало похоже,	Прославленный всадник из горского рода, Увенчанный званьем – хранитель огня,
Иногда оно становится (делается) очень синим.	Поддерживал пламя вблизи небосвода Средь полночи черной и белого дня.
Я – старший среди чабанов на пастбище	Костер полыхал и с грозой в поединке Одерживал верх и осиливал тьму.
И разжигаю огонь, если он гаснет.	И конных, и пеших по кручам тропинки
И если моя искра не гаснет к (достигнет) ночи,	Из дальних сторон приводили к нему.
Она – звезда (как еще один освещенный объект).	И каждый подкладывал в пламя при этом Сухие поленья, колени склоня.
И если путник станет моим гостем, Он (может) удивиться, что (костер) не гаснет.	Седой, озаренный пророческим светом, Советом дарил всех хранитель огня.
Один ли я такой?	К земле обращенная ликом латунным, Луна ль проплывает над гребнями гор,
Каждый разжигает свой огонь.	Иль тучи клубятся, мне в мире подлунном
И до тех пор, пока не настанут	Высокой поэзии виден костёр.

дождливые дни,

Мой небольшой огонь достигает  
(согревает) сердца.

Он освещает нам дорогу,

И не даёт ошибиться находящемуся в  
тумане,

Пока он не дойдет до конца (не  
догорит),

Облегчает горе.

У нас есть Тихонов – старший среди  
чабанов.

Усы его похожи на две огненные  
искры.

Седлайте, поэты, если (ваши) кони  
резвы,

Спешите к заречным облакам [15:226].

*Russian metaphor*

Sometimes the sky is blue like a mirror,  
Sometimes it becomes very blue.

I am the senior among the shepherds in  
the pasture

And I rekindle the fire if it goes out.

And if my spark does not go out by  
(reaches) night,

It is a star (as another illuminated object).

And if the traveler becomes my guest,

He (may) wonder that (the fire) does not  
go out.

Наездники, в сёдла мы прыгаем ныне,

И в небо любой из нас гонит коня,

Где в звёздном соседстве на белой вершине

Живёт седоглавый хранитель огня [17:219].

*Translated by Ya. Kozlovsky*

A glorified horseman of the mountain kin

Crowned by the title 'The keeper of fire',

Maintained a flame near the sky

During black midnight and white day.

The fire burned and in a duel with a thunder-  
storm

Gained the upper hand and conquered the  
darkness.

The paths along the slopes would lead horsemen  
and those on foot

To it from faraway places.

Am I alone like that?	And everyone would feed the flames
Everyone kindles their fire.	With dry logs, knees bent.
And until the rainy days come,	Gray-haired, illumined with prophetic light,
My little fire reaches (warms) hearts.	The keeper of fire would give council to all.
It illuminates the road,	Her brass face towards the earth,
And does not allow the one in a fog to be	The moon floats over the crests of the mountains,
mistaken,	Or clouds swirl, I in the sublunary world
Until it reaches the end (burns out ),	See the fire of high poetry.
(It) relieves grief.	 
 	Riders, we jump in the saddles now,
We have Tikhonov, the eldest among the	And any of us drives a horse towards the sky,
shepherds.	Where in the starry neighborhood on the white
His mustache is like two fiery sparks.	top
Saddle, poets, if (your) horses are quick,	There lives the gray-headed keeper of fire.
Hurry towards the clouds beyond the river	

*Word-for-word translation of Kozlovsky's*

*Word-for-word translation of the Russian version  
metaphrase*

The key in this poem is the image that opens the plot of lyrical empathy - "I am the oldest among shepherds in the pasture // And I rekindle the fire if it goes out". For Ya. Kozlovsky this picture is represented by a symbolic expression that unites the numerous hypostases of the cultural hero, up to his ideological modification. All the European cultural space is permeated with the motif of the hero-civilizer, and the translation is filled with a whole set of these references of the broadest range beginning with Prometheus. It should be noted Kozlovsky does not doubt the obligation to constantly maintain the fire – the associative portrait of a hero fighting darkness assumes this exact character of actions.

Keshokov also writes about the senior shepherd, and his "rekindle the fire if it goes out" has a completely opposite meaning – in any case, in the coordinates of ethnic practices. Senior shepherd, a very real figure for cattlemen, is responsible, among other things, for the rational use of necessary supplies. He does not have to constantly burn fuel, he has to save it, and it must be said that unlike the romantic illusions, in reality the fuel in the pastures burned for the minimal time – specifically, in the evening before going to bed in the process of baking bread

and cooking for tomorrow and in the morning when the food was warmed up, but this was determined by purely rational considerations – low temperatures.

Thus, the action of the Keshokov's hero is not necessary, or rather, it is unusual. He acts contrary to the practices established by centuries, putting moral and ethical reasons at the forefront. The poet not only focuses attention on the uniqueness of his hero but also concentrates the reader's attention on the very fact of the continuity of the fire burning, which completely outlines the nationally recognized model of topos. Although Keshokov does not mention a sheepfold, the indication of the coming 'rainy days' clearly reveals the time and place of action. This is a small mountain sheepfold, the isolated space of which is clear both in terms of its linear dimensions and light-color palette consisting of halftones and subdued colors of a small non-illuminated room.

Ya. Kozlovsky does not have all this, which seems quite natural – his generalized cultural 'fire keeper' is localized very, very roughly ("near the sky"), and the aesthetic ontology of this image is a kind of center of gravity for those around him – not for all, but, in the language of the interpreter, for those who "bowed their knees," "were gifted by the council," and so on.

Quite expectedly and naturally, Kozlovsky violates the archetypal base of the original Kabardian text. In the translation there is no image of a star – only an abstract "prophetic light", initiating a centripetal movement with no fixed direction. Meanwhile, the likeness of fire to a star (even in the vague form observed in the work) is a completely reliable connection with the traditional archetype of the 'lone horseman', perhaps the most archaic in Kabardian consciousness. A star was one of the stable components of the warrior-rider archetype, and in the Kabardian poetic world was always associated with the motive of the road. The unity of all the qualities declared by Keshokov in the image of the senior shepherd – "the inextinguishable bonfire-star", "illuminated road", "movement through the fog" and so on – unambiguously create an image of a leader based on the stable national image of the warrior leader, the leader of the 'zeko' (military raid).

The results of the two lyrical empathy models look completely logical. The translation creates the final image of the mentor-patron, a certain center of attraction, a spiritual mentor and spiritual ideal - the movement towards the sky is in Kozlovsky's interpretation the movement to the likening of poets-riders to the 'guardian of fire'. In the prototype text, the main is the message to the ordered directional movement. This is an active action, close to the military campaign, and the senior shepherd – N. Tikhonov, to whom the poem is dedicated – performs a clearly attributed role of the warrior leader, an ideal "lone rider" who does not gather others around him but sets the direction and serves as an example. This semantic accent of the image

is indisputable – Tikhonov's mustache "similar to the two fiery sparks" completely coincide with the folkloric analogues, emphasizing the aristocracy and the military origin of the possessor.

## RESULTS

Two provisions can be considered as the main results of the study. Firstly, the establishment of active role of non-contextual, substrate-cultural information in forming the perceptual model of the perceived poetic text with the corrective role of the author; second, the revealed stability of the semantic content of traditional formants, implying the preservation of the most archaic layers of information and the consequent development of new meanings.

One of the reasons for neglecting or even ignoring the ethnic cultural substratum was the general dogmatism of socialist realism. Since the end of the 1950s the problems of artistic translation reached the forefront of world and of Soviet literary thought. This affected even the number of studies devoted to the issues of intercultural translation and interpretation: "... In the mid-1960s ... the scope of translation activity throughout the world increased ... Over the decade from 1958 to 1968 the number of books and articles on all forms of translation increased enormously in this country and in other countries" [28: 7-8]. However, the very understanding of the 'technological' issues of text interpretation in the Soviet Union carried a tangible imprint of the ideological plan.

The traditional philosophy of Marxism-Leninism, systematically declaring the primacy of the material, did not at all recognize the possibility of literary recreation of space models that had perceptual quality. This approach was fully preserved in the 1970s; in particular, one of the leading art historians of the Soviet Union, M.S. Kagan, generally denied the presence of a spatial continuum in a literary work, based on the systematization of the types of arts he developed for 'spatial' and 'temporary' [12: 54-56], and, bringing his hypothesis to its logical conclusion, postulated the purely conventional and illusory nature of space-time constructions in the 'aesthetic sphere' [13: 275].

More moderate views on the virtual continuum of the literary work also denied self-sufficiency and an autonomous information resource of the topological sensation, recognizing only the emotive beginning behind it and, in effect, reducing the cognitive universe to the rhythm and sequence of the described experiences: "... Real time and space define coexistence and change of states of really existing objects and processes... As for perceptual space and time,... it is a condition of coexistence and shifts of human feelings and other mental acts of the subject" [11:11].

There were other points of view based on the idea the space of a work of art is formed on a subconscious level and has at least two levels of aesthetic cognition – the controlled one, serving for the figurative expression of the individual's mental movements, and the autonomous one, fixing real coordinate relations and basic coordinate dislocations of the author and the reader. Nevertheless, supporters of the coordinate universe in the literary work in their reasoning do not go any further than denying the versions of their opponents, proving in one way or another the penetration of temporal relations into spatial forms of art but being completely incapable of explaining the essence of continuum models in the literary text. This question is most often simply bypassed with silence [24: 85-102].

## **CONCLUSION**

The problem of translation adequacy is seen by some specialists only in conveying the allusions of the presentation culture, which is conditioned by the very understanding of image semantics – the image is regarded as a kind of textual message ennobled and enriched by external associations, although in a number of studies the idea of ethnic specificity of the very structure of figurative representations is raised [26:273]. However, this informative tier of the artistic text is not even considered when translating into a different language environment, and ignoring the associative cultural area is regarded as the main reason for the decline in the artistic level of translation [8:64]. It should be borne in mind that cultural and civilizational developments of the semantics of a poetic object in the apperceptive process are essentially nothing more than a synchronic act of intercultural communication. They do not disclose transparent semantic links that go to the genetic pre-forms of poetic representations within the framework of a single verbal tradition, that is, they do not reveal the information load that ensures the ethnic specificity of artistic forms.

Thus, this methodological approach was fixed as the only possible in the theory of literary translation: "... The belonging of the units under consideration to a certain level or aspect of the linguistic system is completely irrelevant; the comparison of linguistic units in the theory of translation is made only on the basis of the generality of the content expressed by them, i.e. meaning, in other words, on the basis of the semantic generality of these units, regardless of their belonging to one or to different levels of the language hierarchy" [2:27].

Interest in the originality of aesthetic national expression is manifested only at a glossary level, which, in essence, is inevitable in a multicultural society whose different languages are characterized by uneven development and the presence of numerous communicative gaps in most of them. Again, the denotative layer of image structures was primarily regarded, and the

problem of the so-called 'non-equivalent' units [5: 52-54] was seen as a stumbling block in the correct translation. It must be stated that by the 1960s in the sphere of poetic expression the equivalent vocabulary in the literal sense of the word in the Kabardian language was practically absent; however, Russian correspondences of Adyghe symbolism can be called complete only conditionally – they are rather hyponymic, and in Russian and Kabardian texts only rational layers of figurative semantics are identical, and they do not carry any real specifics, nor traditional and specific national content [7: 102].

On the one hand, this is a purely "technological" problem of providing an interpreter with the necessary volumes of information on the specifics of certain objects, ethnographic observations and statements. From this point of view, today we do not know and, most likely, we will not be able to establish in which mode the translations of Keshokov's poems were created, or what the information support from the author was. Technologically the creation of a translation in any case involves acquaintance with the author's metaphrase.

However, the absolutely clear picture of the identity of Russian and English texts and the approximations of their correspondences to the national prototype cannot be explained fully by the fact that the English poet was only familiar with the Russian variants. The above examples confirm that the most difficult barrier in the formation of transitive imagery is the difference in the most archaic and basic layers of archetypical national cultures in general, and of verbal ethnic systems in particular. Already in the 1960s, translation specialists raised questions of the correct transmission of the ethnic specificity of the text, but the individual beginning of poetic expression was seen in an essential component of ethnicity. In any case, analyzing the translation of one of the works of B. Alykulov, made by Yu. Gordienko, V. Levik noted that "... everything that was deeply personal, individual, and national making the poem alive, sincere, making it a work of poetry, was lost" [20: 100-101].

Without denying the significance of the individual endowments of passionaries, we nevertheless note that the translation of cross-cutting national archetypes based on epic ethno-aesthetic dominants depends on the paradigmatic state of the sphere of dualistic culturally poetic representations [3]. A. Keshokov, who acted as the main creator of this sphere from the Kabardian side, throughout his creative activity was concerned with the integration of the national consciousness into the Russian and world civilization space at the conceptual level. He formed a full-fledged system of aesthetic reflection within the boundaries of ethnic thinking – a system that extended in its reflex capabilities from the basic non-spatial and timeless matrices of myth and epic to the sensory-saturated concreteness of materialized representations. However, from the point of view of intercultural communication, Keshokov

was probably fulfilling a clearly understood, ambitious yet limited task which was to integrate Kabardian poetic thinking into the information and ideological environment of the state. Institutional archetypes of ethnic culture and worldview in their entirety were not necessary to fulfill these adaptive tasks [30], and it seems quite natural that in foreign language interpretations A. Keshokov's texts were understood by translators precisely in those apperceptive boundaries that were designated by the Kabardian poet himself.

## REFERENCES

1. Astvatsaturyan E. Weapons of the peoples of the Caucasus [Oruzhiye narodov Kavkaza]. M.-Nalchik: Hobbykniga-El-Fa, 1995. 192 p.
2. Barkhudarov L.S. Languages and translation. (Questions of general and particular theory of translation) [Yazyki i perevod. (Voprosy obshchey i chastnoy teorii perevoda)]. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya, 1975. 240 p.
3. Borova A.R. Aesthetic archetypes of Circassian poetry: genesis and intercultural exchange [Esteticheskiye arkhetyipy adygs koy poezii: genezis i mezhkulturnyy obmen]. Nalchik: Publishing Department of KBIHR, 2015. 206 p.
4. Bronevsky S. The latest geographic and historical news about the Caucasus [Noveyskiye geograficheskiye i istoricheskiye izvestiya o Kavkaze]. M.: The printing house of Selivanovsky, 1823. 465 p.
5. Vereshchagin E.M., Kostomarov V.G. Language and culture. Linguistic geography in teaching Russian as a foreign language [Yazyk i kultura. Lingvostranovedeniye v prepodavanii russkogo yazyka kak inostrannogo]. Moscow: MGU, 1973. 253 p.
6. Vinogradov V.V. Language of Pushkin [Yazyk Pushkina]. M., L.: Academia, 1935. 457 p.
7. Vinogradov V.S. Lexical issues of the translation of artistic prose [Leksicheskiye voprosy perevoda khudozhestvennoy prozy]. Moscow: MGU, 1978. 174 p.
8. Ganiev V. Image as an element of accuracy [Obraznost kak element tochnosti]. Moscow: Soviet writer, 1964. 265 p.
9. Derzhavin G.R. Compositions [Sochineniya]. SPb.: Publishing house of the Emperor Alexander Nikolaevich, 1872. Vol.7. 659 p.
10. Zhukovsky V.A. Works in verse and prose [Sochineniya v stikhakh i proze]. St. Petersburg: Glazunov Edition. 1901, 1007 p.
11. Zobov R.A., Mostepanenko A.M. On the typology of spatial-temporal relations in the sphere of art // Rhythm, space and time in literature and art [O tipologii prostranstvenno-

vremennykh otnosheniy v sfere iskusstva // Ritm, prostranstvo i vremya v literature i iskusstve]. L.: Nauka, 1974. 168 p.

12. Kagan M.S. Lectures on the Marxist-Leninist aesthetics [Leksii po marksistsko-leninskoy estetike]. Leningrad: LSU, 1964, 159 p.

13. Kagan M.S. Morphology of art: Historical and theoretical study of the internal structure of the art world [Morfologiya iskusstva: Istoriko-teoreticheskoye issledovaniye vnutrennego stroyeniya mira iskusstv]. L.: Iskusstvo, 1972. 440 p.

14. Kazharova I.A. Kabardian poetry of the twentieth century: actualization of the ideal [Kabardinskaya poeziya XX veka: aktualizatsiya ideala]. Nalchik: Pechatny dvor, 2014. 176 p.

15. Keshokov A.P. Collected Works. Verses and poems [Sobraniye sochineniy. Stikhotvoreniya i poemy]. Nalchik: Elbrus, 2004. 511 p.

16. Keshokov A.P. A stellar hour [Zvezdny chas]. Moscow: Progress, 1981. 288 p.

17. Keshokov A.P. Collected Works [Sobraniye sochineniy]. M.: Khudozhestvennaya literatura, 1982. 493 p.

18. Keshokov A.P. The brand [Tavro]. Nalchik: Elbrus, 1969. 182 p.

19. Kuchukova Z.A. Ontological metacode as the core of ethno-poetics [Ontologicheskiy metakod kak yadro etnopoetiki]. Nalchik: Publishing House of M and V. Kotlyarov, 2005. 312 p.

20. Levik V. The right word to the right place // Translation skills [Vernoye slovo – na vernoye mesto // Masterstvo perevoda]. Moscow: Soviet writer, 1964. 541 p.

21. Längle A. «Person. Existential-analytic theory of personality». Moscow: Progress, 2005. 159 p.

22. Pushkin A.S. The complete works [Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy]. M.-L.: AS SSSR, 1949. Vol. 12, p.306

23. Pushkin A.S. Collected works [Sochineniya]. St. Petersburg. 1838. 242 p.

24. Rhythm, space and time in literature and art: Collection of articles [Ritm, prostranstvo i vremya v literature i iskusstve: Sbornik statey]. L.: Nauka, 1974. 299 p.

25. Stolyarov M.P. The art of translating artistic prose [Iskusstvo perevoda khudozhestvennoy prozy]. Literary critic, 1939. No.5-6. 249 p.

26. Tolgurov T.Z. Evolution of tissue image structures in the newly written poetic systems of the North Caucasus [Evolyutsiya tkanevykh obraznykh struktur v novopimennykh poeticheskikh sistemakh Severnogo Kavkaza]. Nalchik: El-Fa, 2004. 284 p.

27. Thagazitov Yu.M., Tolgurov T.Z. Topological formants of the ethical and aesthetic consciousness of Kabardians and Balkarians [Topologicheskiye formanty etiko-esteticheskogo soznaniya kabardintsev i balkartsev // Gumanitarnyye, sotsialno-ekonomicheskkiye i obshchestvennyye nauki] // Humanitarian, socio-economic and social sciences. Krasnodar, 2015, No. 11., Vol.2, 281 p.
28. Fedorov A.V. Fundamentals of the general theory of translation (linguistic problems) [Osnovy obshchey teorii perevoda (lingvisticheskiye problemy)]. St. Petersburg: Philological Faculty of St. Petersburg State University. Moscow: Philologia tri, 2002. 416 p.
29. Heidegger M. Being and time. Kharkov. Folio. 2003. 503 p.
30. Khakusheva M.A. Literary archetypes in the works of Adyghe writers [Literaturnyye arkhetypy v khudozhestvennykh proizvedeniyakh adygskiykh pisateley]. Nalchik: KBSC RAS, 2007, 378 p.
31. Chukovsky K.I. High art [Vysokoye iskusstvo]. L. Goslitizdat. 1941, 259 p.
32. Scherba L.V. Experiments of linguistic interpretation of poems. 'The Pine' by Lermontov in comparison with its German prototype [Opyty lingvisticheskogo tolkovaniya stikhotvoreniy. «Sosna» Lermontova v sravnenii s yeyo nemetskim prototipom]. / Soviet linguistics. L.: Leningrad Scientific Research Institute of Linguistics. 1936. p. 129-142.
33. Jung K. Archetype and the symbol. M. Renaissance IV Ewo. 1991. 304 p.
34. Jaspers K. Language // Philosophy of language and semiotics. Ivanovo. IvSU. 1995. 347 p.
35. Dawkins R. The Selfish Gene. London: Granada, 1978. 501 p.
36. Michel Foucault, Les Mots et les Choses. Une archeology des sciences humaines, Paris: Gallimard, coll. « Bibliothèque des sciences humaines», 1966, 400 p.
37. Parsons T., Bales R. Family, socialization and interaction process. NY. The Three University Press. 1955. 422 p.

**How to cite this article:**

Borova A R, Bauaev K K, Musukaeva Kh A, Timizhev K T, Bozieva N B, Khulchaeva M Kh. Cultural interpretation of ethnic archetypes. J. Fundam. Appl. Sci., 2018, 10(2S), 632-659.