

**TRANSITIVITY OF STABLE SYMBOLISM OF ADYGHE POETRY
(WORKS OF A. KESHOKOV)**

**TRANSITIVIDADE DO SIMBOLISMO ESTÁVEL DA POESIA ADIGUE
(TRABALHOS DE A. KESHOKOV)**

**TRANSITIVIDAD DEL SIMBOLISMO ESTABLE DE LA POESÍA ADYGHE
(OBRAS DE A. KESHOKOV)**

Asiyat Ruslanovna BOROVA¹
Khamisha Tarkanovich TIMIZHEV²
Naima Borisovna BOZIEVA³
Mar'yam Khazhidautovna KHUL'CHAEVA⁴
Marina Vladimirovna BITOKOVA⁵

ABSTRACT: The purpose of the article – is to analyze the translations of the Kabardian poet from the point of view of the preservation of substrate information in foreign texts. The leading approach to the study of this problem is the study of the ethnic archetype semantics of a general constitutional nature and the consideration of concrete examples proving that the cross-cutting motives of national Kabardian thinking, formed based on specific ethical standards and ideals of the people, are not taken into account in translations. The main conclusion that the authors come to is that the adequacy of foreign-language interpretations of poetic works should be based not only on profound and detailed footnotes but, first of all, on a deep study of the life practices of the ethnic group, especially those that directly shaped the behavioral norms of the people in the past and continue to retain their significance today.

KEYWORDS: North caucasian (Kabardian) poetry. Authenticity. National image of the world. Foreign cultural interpretation. Symbol.

RESUMO: O objetivo do artigo é analisar as traduções do poeta cabardiano do ponto de vista da preservação de informações de substrato em textos estrangeiros. A abordagem principal para o estudo deste problema é o estudo da semântica do arquétipo étnico de natureza constitucional geral e a consideração de exemplos concretos que comprovam que os motivos transversais do pensamento cabardiano nacional, formado com base em padrões éticos e ideais específicos do pessoas, não são levados em consideração nas traduções. A principal conclusão a que os autores chegam é que a adequação das interpretações em

¹ Kabardino-Balkarian State University named after H.M. Berbekov (KBSU), Nalchik – Russia. Professor. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0079-6956>. E-mail: assbora@mail.ru

² Kabardino-Balkarian State University named after H.M. Berbekov (KBSU), Nalchik – Russia. Professor. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6776-8004>. E-mail: timizhev.ha@mail.ru

³ Kabardino-Balkarian State University named after H.M. Berbekov (KBSU), Nalchik – Russia. Associate Professor. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0767-2825>. E-mail: naimabozieva@mail.ru

⁴ Kabardino-Balkarian State University named after H.M. Berbekov (KBSU), Nalchik – Russia. Associate Professor. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9871-8202>. E-mail: mariam.li.18@yandex.ru

⁵ Kabardino-Balkarian State University named after H.M. Berbekov (KBSU), Nalchik – Russia. Associate Professor. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6928-3115>. E-mail: mariebitok@gmail.com

língua estrangeira de obras poéticas deve basear-se não apenas em notas de rodapé profundas e detalhadas, mas, antes de tudo, em um estudo profundo das práticas de vida do grupo étnico, especialmente aqueles que moldaram diretamente as normas comportamentais das pessoas no passado e continuam a manter seu significado hoje.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Poesia norte-caucasiana (Kabardiana). Autenticidade. Imagem nacional do mundo. Interpretação cultural estrangeira. Símbolo.*

RESUMEN: *El propósito del artículo es analizar las traducciones del poeta kabardiano desde el punto de vista de la preservación de la información del sustrato en textos extranjeros. El enfoque principal para el estudio de este problema es el estudio de la semántica del arquetipo étnico de naturaleza constitucional general y la consideración de ejemplos concretos que prueban que los motivos transversales del pensamiento nacional kabardiano, formados en base a estándares éticos e ideales específicos de la personas, no se tienen en cuenta en las traducciones. La principal conclusión a la que llegan los autores es que la adecuación de las interpretaciones en lengua extranjera de obras poéticas debe basarse no sólo en notas a pie de página profundas y detalladas sino, ante todo, en un estudio profundo de las prácticas de vida de la etnia, especialmente aquellos que dieron forma directa a las normas de comportamiento de las personas en el pasado y continúan conservando su importancia en la actualidad.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Poesía norcaucásica (Kabardiana). Autenticidad. Imagen nacional del mundo. Interpretación cultural extranjera. Símbolo.*

Introduction

The foreign-cultural interpretation of the works of the poets of the North Caucasus, despite a great many of the brightest and most highly professional interpreters, whose work was closely associated with the region in the 60s - 70s of the last century, leaves many questions open. And, of course, the main of them is the semantic completeness and accuracy of the transcriptions, although there is no doubt about the aesthetic, artistic consistency of the texts of Grebnev, Lipkin, Kozlovsky (FEDOROV, 2002), and other masters of the Soviet school of translation.

The practitioners of poetic translation in the Soviet era remained within the boundaries of pre-revolutionary approaches due to the imprint of the originality of Russian methods of interpretation, initially focused on the free translation of the original text. Their essence is best expressed by Zhukovsky's famous formula: "An interpreter in prose is a slave; an interpreter in verse is a rival" (ZHUKOVSKY, 1901, p. 833). It should be taken into account that the Russian literary thought was one of the first to form the awareness that an artistic text should preserve its ethnic specificity when translated from the original language. Russian authors,

who until the end of the first quarter of the XIX century felt themselves to be elements of a peripheral cultural system, could not ignore the issues of national identity and authenticity of works. A.S. Pushkin was one of the first both in Russia and Europe to record and welcome the departure from "correctional translation", rightly believing that the aesthetic significance of a literary text largely depends on the preservation of its "own kind" and "folk clothes" (PUSHKIN, 1949, p. 137).

This question could not but worry Russian authors, because in their understanding of the fate of national culture since the time of Peter I and Catherine II, they had no unambiguous and clear prospects, and this circumstance was felt quite relevant by Derzhavin (1872). Moreover, the preservation and development of Russian literature in its authentic forms was understood by the authors as the earliest possible creation of fundamental mechanisms for the integration of ethnic aesthetic space into the pan-European one. Therefore, the national content of the poetic work was seen by the Russian authors in the style, in the presentation of peculiar forms of national prototypes. In any case, the definition of Pushkin – "this strange rhetorical turn" (PUSHKIN, 1838, p. 216), characterizing the stable figures of the Koran, clearly dating back to the direct life experience of the Arabs – in this sense is rather unambiguous and eloquent. Pushkin was not concerned with the transfer of recreational, archetypal information of these expressions. He was interested in their exoticism and the possibilities of foreign cultural labeling of the text, and, most importantly – the acceptability and accessibility of the relevant information contained in them for the Russian, wider – European – reader. It was about creating a wide range of poetic representation and expression compatible with European analogues (BOROVA, 2021).

The selection and formation of units of poetic language in conditions of the 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 autological lexemes in the context of the conceptual apparatus of the French language: "Someday I must say out loud that the Russian metaphysical language is still in a wild state." Pushkin expresses himself very clearly about translations from French, taking as a desirable norm the position when "the Gallicisms of words, syntactic, or material, are excluded" and "the Gallicisms of concepts, speculative, are allowed, because they are already Europeanisms" (VINOGRADOV, 1935, p. 239).

Speaking of "syntactic" Gallicisms, Pushkin meant lexemes used in everyday speech that had semantic addressees in the real environment. In general, the attitude of the great Russian poet to conceptual structures is most clearly expressed not by himself: in the first

decades of the century before last, the actual evolutionary needs of national speech forced writers several times to change their views on the harmfulness and usefulness of barbarisms. Only a temporary distance allowed us to abstract from the random fluctuations of Russian public thought in this matter and express a more or less integral opinion:

[...] The struggle against the mechanical assimilation of the peculiarities of French semantics did not entail, 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, the reasons for its strength and weakness were hidden. The strength was in the transparency and accuracy of expressions, in the developed system of abstract concepts (VINOGRADOV, 1935, p. 239).

Finally, within the boundaries of the Russian classical literary tradition, a system of adequate translation of literary texts into European (and any other) languages was fully formed, however, in general, the lower information horizon of this system did not extend beyond the denotative levels of apperception. The semantics of deeper levels of archetypal, spatial, temporal, and recreational representations remained beyond the interpreter's perception, which, strictly speaking, determines the methodology of our research in this article.

Methods

Methodological framework of the research goes back not so much to literary theories and studies, as to the provisions of history, philosophy, sociology, ethnography and psychology formulated in the works of Foucault, Jung, Heidegger, Langle, Persons, Dawkins, Jaspers, and some other scientists and philosophers. Our approach is based on 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 mimes, emblems, and symbols, moral imperatives. The schemes for analyzing the substrate information of texts are either original author's developments, or come from some specific studies: "Family, socialization and interaction process" (PARSONS; BALES, 1955), "Person. Existential-analytical theory of personality" (LANGLE, 2005), "Selfish gene" (DAWKINS, 1978), "Being and Time" (HEIDEGGER, 2003), "Archetype and Symbol" (JUNG, 1991), "Words and things. Archeology of the Humanities" (FOUCAULT, 1966), "Language//Philosophy of Language and Semiotics" (JASPERS, 1995).

Results and discussions

The theory and practice of translation is a long-standing object of interest for both literary critics, poets, and prose writers. As already mentioned, A.S. Pushkin showed serious interest in this subject and laid the foundations for a modern understanding of the functions and content of translation. However, with the emergence of a new community of kinds of literature of the USSR folks, it turned out that the methods, ontology, and tools of traditional "Russian" translation are not fully functional when it comes to the translation of literary texts of authors belonging to the so-called "new-written" systems of literature. There was a situation when the comprehension of theoretical issues was noticeably lagging behind the actual practice. It happened, first of all, because the consciousness of the authors, for example, of the North Caucasus, completely preserved the information content relating not only to the times of ritual class etiquette and highly specialized norms of military morality but was uniquely affixed to the space of myth and national epos. The Soviet teaching on translation was mainly interested in the "technology" of interlingual transcription, adapted to the existing system. Priority was given to those areas of scientific research that attributed the moments of commutation commonality of different cultures and languages. Therefore, even in the presence of profound and subtle works on the peculiarities of the lexical (SHCHERBA, 1936, p. 129-142), syntactic (CHUKOVSKY, 1941), even grammatical (STOLYAROV, 1939) translation of texts, and generalizing complex works (FEDOROV, 2002), issues of foreign cultural interpretation of semantic components of works, transitivity which was in doubt, remained outside the area of interest of scientists. This attempt to analyze the nature of the substrate information of Keshokov's poems is one of the first examples of this kind; concerning the works of authors of the North Caucasus and, in particular, Kabardian (Adyghe) authors, it is undoubtedly the first. For a long time, the situation with translations of North Caucasian poets was determined by the fact that although the path to semantic correspondences to the Russian apperceptive field for newly written kinds of literature began in the 30s of the last century, the residual influence of the tradition established in the XIX century made the sphere of denotative poetic representation the preferred sector of translation. To be more precise, it is the area of "common" symbolic and poetic expressions, built not even by national poets, but by Russian authors throughout the XIX - XX centuries. Those works whose imagery was initially based on aesthetic universals of this type retain their semantics to the greatest extent in Russian and English versions:

Poka zhiviyom – na zemle (ne dolzhna) propast' chest'. ZHiviyot chelovek v mire slovom i hlebom
Tot, ch'i stihy dohodyat do serdca, I dolzhen ot prazdnogo gula vdali imeet pravo na svoe slovo. Poet obladat' nezavisimym nebom,
Kto seet nam hleb – ne (dolzhen byt') lishen A pahar' – hot' malym nadelom zemli.
svoej pashni,
(On) zerno vybiraet i otdaet tem, u kogo ego net. Kol' slovo drevnej ostal'nogo na svete, I hleb vekovechen pod zhyoltoj lunoj,
U togo, kto delaet dobro, vseгда mnogo chesti. Lyuboj zemlepashec pred polem v otvete,
Tot, ch'ej dushoj ovladelo lishnee (nepravednoe), Lyuboj stihotvorec – pred celoj stranoy.
budet nakazan za svoyu nespravedlivost'. (KESHOKOV, 1982, p. 285).

*Esli tebe dostalas' pashnya – bud' veren
vspahannoy toboj zemle.*

Translated by Ya . Kozlovsky

Esli poet imeet pravo na slovo,

na nego nadeetsya ego zemlya (rodina) (KESHOKOV, 2004, p. 397).

Apart from ideologically determined changes in certain semantic nuances of the poem and the "withdrawal" of two lines of the second verse, Ya. Kozlovsky in this translation has almost completely preserved the semantics and modality of the original. However, given a certain religious and mystical connotation of these marked lines, their removal may also well be explained by the pressure of extra-literary factors. The English version of the work is also as adequate as possible:

Man's world is one of words and bread. Mir cheloveka – edinstvo (est') slova i hleba.

The poet, shunning idle mirth, Poet, izbegayushchij prazdnogo vesel'ya,
Needs boundless heaven overhead. Nuzhdaetsya v svobodnom nebe nad golovoj.

The ploughman needs a plot of earth. Pahar' nuzhdaetsya v uchastke zemli.

Mankind's most ancient skill is speech Drevnejshee iskusstvo cheloveka – eto rech'

And bread is ever in demand. I hleb vseгда v sprose (bol'shom).

The ploughman answers to his field, Pahar' otvechaet za svoyu pole,

The poet – to his native land. Poet – za svoyu rodnuyu zemlyu (KESHOKOV, 1981, p. 231).

The only conceptually significant discrepancy 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 scale of his responsibility.

In most of his works, A. Keshokov did not limit himself to conditional poetic idiomatics of the mediator type, and the presence of ethnic archetypes in his texts immediately raises the question of the meaningful correspondence of translations to the originals. At the same time, there are no comments of this kind regarding Russian-speaking and English-speaking interpretations. Keshokov's English-language transcriptions are completely adequate in comparison with their Russian prototypes - the sets of the objects mentioned indicate that the English versions of the Kabardian poet's poems were written mainly from Russian translations: in no way coinciding with the originals, they 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[...] (KESHOKOV, 1981, p. 37).

A literal redub of the English version shows its complete identity of the Ya. Kozlovsky's version.:

Cvet radosti vo vse veka (epohi) byl belyj, Cvet radosti belym schitalsya ot veka,
Kak vishnyovyj cvet vesnoj. Kak veshchij chereshnevyj cvet,
I greben' El'brusa, i zubchataya vershina Kazbeka S vershiny El'brusa i grebnya Kazbeka
CHistyj svet, bezuprechno belyj, nam dostavlyayut. Techyot nezapyatnannyj svet.
Zvuki kolokol'chika nad dorogimi rodnymi polyanami – Zvenit kolokol'chik nad otchim predelom,
(V) Lastochke s beloju sverkayushchej grud'yu. U lastochki v beloju grudi,
Vyhodyashchaya zamuzh nevesta, vsya v belom odeyanii, Na svad'be nevesta piruet vsya v belom
Prazdnuet sredi vesolyh gostej [...] (KESHOKOV, 1969, p. 21) Vesolyh gostej posredi... (KESHOKOV, 1982, p. 224).

And the same undoubted difference with the source. It is not a stretch to say that the similarity between the Kabardian (primary) version and the English final is quite approximate – the poem is hardly recognizable:

Idya navstrechu schastlivoj radosti,
Odevayut belosnezhnyu burku.
Vot El'brus ili Kazbek
Odety v snezhnye burki.

Esli nastupaet samaya temnaya noch',
– Ona ne lishena belogo siyaniya zvezdy,..
(Belym) okazyvayut chest' vsadniku,
Osedlavshemu konya.
Esli sitec ne budet belym.
Sama nevesta nedovol'na,
S nastupleniem vesny ni polya, ni ogorody
Ne cvetut bez belogo (KESHOKOV, 1969, p. 21).

It is indisputable that Walter May's translation skills were wasted in this case. The play of the English poet on the consonance of "merry" in its two meanings ("cherry" and "merry"), perhaps, brought something to the semantics of the white color proposed by Keshokov, but the very appearance of a flowering tree in the text is an obvious artistic arbitrariness of Kozlovsky. And, of course, the "bride feasting 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 image that Keshokov had in mind. In this sense, the English translation is even more acceptable – the Adyghe bride, in May's understanding, at least vaguely "celebrates among the guests", and not "feasts".

Let's repeat: Apparently, many of Keshokov's translations into English were made from Russian texts. The majority of them are full-fledged transcriptions of these "secondary" prototypes, demonstrating not just an exact adherence to the source, but even a more complete and aesthetically perfect disclosure of the lyrical models built by Ya. Kozlovsky – we have allowed ourselves to limit ourselves to the texts of this translator:

Two blades belonging to a single dagger. Dva lezviya slivayutsya (dlyatsya)
v edinom kinzhale.
Stand back to back. Together do they fase, Spina k spine. Vmeste delaya
svoj oblik,
One enemy, one risk, a single danger, Odin vrag (u nih), odin risk, edinaya
opasnost'
And share between them triumph and disgrace. I dolya mezh nimi – triumf
ili pozor.

By those who knew the secrets of the trade, Lish' tem, kto znal tajny remesla
–
So custom ruled, alone the daggers made; Po obychayu – edinstvennyj, kto
delal kinzhal;
A man might learn them only of his father Muzhchina mog uznat' eto u otca,
And teach them to his son and to no other. I nauchit' etomu svoego syna i
nikogo drugogo.

The dagger's code was not a slavish code; Zakon kinzhala – ne zakon raba;
Its vow could not be broken, that is certain. Ego obet ne mozhet byt'
narushen, esli on dan.

And yet its blades might bear dark stains: a curtain. I eshche ego lezviya mogut nosit' tyomnoe pyatno:
Sealed off the past's remote and tortuous road. Klejmo davno projdennoj i izvilistoj dorogi.
The dagger, when in time it was perfected, Kinzhal, ostavshijsya vo vremeni sovershennym,
Helped men attain both good and evil goals, Pomogal dobit'sya bozh'ej i d'yavol'skoj celi,
And, used by lord and commoner, reflected I, ispol'zuemyj bondom ili obshchinnikom, otrazhaet
The base and lofty movements of the soul... Nizkoe ili vysokoe dvizhenie dushi [...] (KESHOKOV, 2004, p. 33).

Comparing May's text with Keshokov 's original and Ya Kozlovsky's translation we see that the English interpreter, perhaps, was not even familiar with the source and was completely guided by the Russian version, which he, having completely preserved the semantics, undoubtedly improved, despite the recognized skill of the Soviet poet:

U odnogo kinzhala lezviya (dva) ne odinakovy: Dva lezviya kinzhala odnogo,
Oдно бо́лее острое, другое тупое, Они спиной обрашчены друг к другу.
No, chto by ne sovershil kinzhal – I mezh soboyu delyat otogo
Vina lezhit odinakovo na oboih lezviyah. Odin pozor ili odnu zaslugu.
My perenosim bezgranichnye trudnosti: Kovat' kinzhaly poluchal prava
Izdavna kinzhal delayut Lish' tot, kto oruzhejnikom rodilsya
Perezvivaya ne o svad'bah – I posvyashchen byl v tajnu masterstva, –
Malo li u nego neterpelivyh (vladel'cev)? V gorah obyčaj etot sohranilsya.
Komu dostalas' rana ot kinzhala... Kinzhalu dan karakter ne raba,
Dumaesh', on zasluženno prolil krov'? Oboih lezviy klyatva nerushima,
Tot, u kogo bezvremenno pogib rodstvennik, No kto zaverit, chto nepogreshima
Vot – do sih por derzhit traur. V vekah kinzhala tajnaya sud'ba?
Kogda kinzhal byl u carya, Dostigshij sovershennogo oblich'ya, On valil vsekh, kto popadalsya na glaza. V ruke prostolyudina i pasha
Esli upryamyj natachivaet kinzhal, On otrazhal dushevnoe velich'e
On ne blestit – (tak kak vladelec) hochet plohogo. Il' nizkoe padenie dushi.
Dva lezviya kinzhala derzhat'sya drug za druga, CHest' ne dvulika. I ne raz, byvalo,
I schast'e oboih odinakovo. Kinzhal nadyozhno zashchishchal eyo.
Esli on (vladelec) byl umen i zashchishchal dobro, Ne potomu l' dva lezviya kinzhala
Dobro i dlya nego sobirayut (dazhe) po krupicam. Edinoe slivaet ostriyo.
Podobno dvum lezviyam kinzhala, Mercaet stal' holodnaya surovo,
(Ya ne dayu) ne raskhodyatsya moi slova i chuvstva. I ya zhelayu bolee vsego,
Ya odarivayu lyudej dobrom, Chtoby slivalis' istina i slovo,
Ya udelyayu vnimanie chelovecheskim mechtam. Kak lezviya kinzhala odnogo.
(KESHOKOV, 2004, p. 228; KESHOKOV, 1982, p. 222).

Translated by Kozlovsky, who was the main Russian author who worked with the texts of A. Keshokov, demonstrates one of the types of free, artistic interpretation. But, being quite acceptable to the reader who does not know the semantics of the prototype work, he, in principle, presents us with a poem written: "based on" the "Dagger", which absolutely does not take into account the lyrical 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 environment of a reliable illusion. Upon reaching the necessary level of writing skills, he prefers a continuum with the characteristics of physical reality even outside of expressed typological constructions. A natural expression of this type of apperception will be a "real", "materialized" description of objects.

We have already referred to this poem by Keshokov and stated that, Ya. Kozlovsky managed to convey the sensory fullness of the dagger. However, in the second verse Kozlovsky goes into the sphere of moral and ethical "statuization" of the object, for reasons that are unclear at first glance, introducing into the work both "a born gunsmith", and "the custom of making a dagger", and "the secret of skill". None of this is in the original.

The difficulties of perception and the creation of an integral sequence of perceptual pictures begin with the Ya. Kozlovsky from the first presentation of the dagger as an isolated object saturated with external associativity. He sets the appearance of the dagger, but this is the visible embodiment of the blade—a symbol that is not actualized in reality. And therefore, the translation is based on the further injection of denotations, poetic idioms, and universals of conceptual quality.

Meanwhile, the only reason for these semantic deviations is an incorrect understanding of the first verse. The Russian interpreter was guided by daggers replicated in the frontier zone, which represented generalized isolated objects, all the semantics of which are localized in the zone of cultural universal meanings. The Keshokov's dagger, sculpted in this poem, is completely real, in the first verse the poet does not just point out to us a particular detail of his appearance (KAZHAROVA, 2014) – he sets the temporary and social environment of the "dagger", and their definiteness inevitably takes the object out of the sphere of conventional expressions.

"The blades (two) of one dagger are not the same// One is sharper / the other is blunt" is not an abstract poetic image. Keshokov is talking about the so-called "black dagger" ("kama fytse"), whose owners in everyday life were mostly not Kabardian warks, but peasants. Being much larger than its aristocratic kinsman, "kame fytse" was used not only in

fights but also in household work, and one side of it was not sharpened as thoroughly as the combat side. Thus, Keshokov fully identifies an object in real ethnic time and space with one detail, he accurately describes its appearance with one feature – if the Wark weapons could be very different in finish and size, then the "black daggers" were practically the same. Consequently, for an ethnic reader, mentioning the difference in the sharpening of the blades was equivalent to a direct description of a large horn handle, dark metal, leather scabbard without silver trim, and so on.

As we understand, in this case we can talk about the actualization of the described object in various cultural and information fields – the Keshokov's dagger is tied to the real environment of Kabardian national existence, the Kozlovsky's blade is moved to the field of cultural associations. Such a relocation inevitably affects the nature of the perception of space: the national has perceptual specificity, as for the duplicated one, we can say that it is completely conditional and does not have a communicative quality, the objects of the translated text are interconnected only at 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 just combined in a single blade – they "last" in it, longitudinally merge, setting a completely visible shape and linear extension.

Another example demonstrating the transfer of the description from the national lyrical chronotope to the unified "conditionally poetic" one:

Nash narod ot svoego slova ne otstupalsya
Slov na veter predki ne brosal,
I ne privyk k ruzh'yu pered ochagom.
I ne strelyali v oblachnuyu vys'.
I esli oni (predki) vynimali svoj golyj kinzhal,
I, celuya sin' kalyonoy stali,
– Gore tomu, iz-za kogo oni ego vynimali.
Pered boem slovom ne klyalis'.

Esli oni ukorachivali stremena,
I glasila nadpis' na kinzhale,
To vstupali v boj – slova ih byli korotki.
CHtob lihie pomnili muzhi:
Prishedshego gostya oni sravnivali s bogom
«Iz nozhon ne vyrvi bez pechali,
I (provozhaya) pokazyvali emu vernyj put'.
I bez slavy v nozhny ne vložhi!»

Podumaj i skazhi, esli hochesh' govorit',
Gde dela ne v slove byli gromki,
I ne sadis', ne osmotrevshis' – Rech' vznuzdat' umeli,
kak konya.
Na etih tradiciyah vospityvali rozhdayushchihsya detej,
Vpryam' za mnogoslovie potomki
I tot, kto byl s eti ne soglasen – lishalsya slova.
Upreknut kogda-nibud' menya.

Ya mnogo raz govoril lishnie slova,
Ne vseгда priderzhivalsya pravil
No ne schitajte menya lgunom, – Tekh ya, chto myatezhnyj chtil Kavkaz,
V moih knigah stihov net ni odnogo slova,
No v stihah ne lgal i ne lukavil,
Ne vyshedshego iz serdca. Plakavshij nad vymyslom ne raz.

(KESHOKOV, 2004, P. 208; KESHOKOV, 1981, p. 58).

Translated by Ya. Kozlovsky - and the English version of the first verses of the work with a literal translation:

Of words our ancestors were sparing. Slova nashih predkov byli skudny.
They would send no volleys up the skies. Oni ne posylali zalpov vverh v nebo.
Kissing their daggers before warring, Celuya svoi kinzhaly pered bitvoj,
They would never utter boastful cries. Oni nikogda ne izdavali hvastlivykh krikov.

They were true to the one inscription Oni byli verny odnoj nadpisi
On hard steel that bore no speck of rust: Na surovoj stali bez pyatnyshka rzhavchiny:
"Do not leave your sheath without good reason, «Ne pokidaj nozhny bez vazhnoj prichiny,
With glory back in it be thrust!" Vozvrashchajsysya so slavoj, v etom bud' rezok!» (KESHOKOV, 1981, p. 59).

It's not hard to see that I am. Kozlovsky finds himself again in captivity not so much of "Caucasian" as of Russian "frontier" poetic representations, from the first lines of his translation, plunging into this cultural background, he must further develop it, imposing on the reader a kind of approximate "eastern" world, far enough from Keshokov's representations.

The literal statement of the Kabardian author "if the ancestors took out their dagger // woe to the one who caused it", reflected in the idiomatics of the people as an obligatory ethical and behavioral norm, Ya. Kozlovsky interprets in a pathos system completely strange to the Adygs.

Following this path, the interpreter is forced to continue presenting the reader a generalized image of the "eastern" knight, saturating the text with his paintings, far from the historical reality of the ethnos. The Adygs did not know such a ritual action as kissing a blade, and the behavior of the wark warriors before the battle was purely "technical", preparatory in nature – oaths were unnecessary for them since the adat disciplinary norms were extremely strict - the leader of a military campaign could execute any warrior, even if he belonged to the princely estate: "... Kabardians ... elect the chief commander from the dukes not by seniority of the family, but by personal bravery and general trust... In the field, he has the power to execute disobedient persons to death without trial and discrimination of persons, but refrains from such strictness regarding princely persons, to avoid family enmity and blood feud" (BRONEVSKY, 1823, p. 121).

Then the "inscription on the dagger" appears in the translation. This detail is also alien to national military norms – even sayings from the Koran on Adyghe blades were not allowed, the attitude towards them was so careful that only furrows were forged on them, it was believed that any kinds of ornaments and inscriptions reduce the strength of weapons. E. Astvatsaturyan notes that the names of the early Circassian gunsmiths are unknown – the brands of the manufacturers appear on the blades only from the second half of the XIX century (ASTVATSATURYAN, 1995, p. 27), she also writes that Dagestan sabers and daggers were often decorated with lengthy sayings and even drawings.

Thus, there was another movement of the lyrical chronotope "to the east". In the English translation, this led to an indirect description of the pre-combat ritual peculiar to the Celtic tribes: "They never made boastful cries before the battle" W. May noticed in the Ya. Kozlovsky's interpretation something that reminded him of the norms of Western combat behavior in their archaic (for an Englishman) specifics – the European knights also have not kissed their blades since the Crusades. Briefly summarizing the comparative analysis of the Kabardian texts of Keshokov and their Russian and English interpretations, it can be asserted that the reason for the inadequacy of the interpretation of the works was the inability to express in translation the features of the national archetypes recorded by the Kabardian poet in the form of specific figurative details.

In this case, we are talking about the deepest layers of consciousness, such as spatial thinking, or the systematization of retical pictures. Taking everything into account, it cannot be said that the spatial characteristics of Keshokov's works "dropped out" Ya. Kozlovsky's of sight. We know many poems in which the Russian author reproduces the continuum constructions of the Kabardian poet, up to the exact observance of the procedural-vectorial methods of forming a virtual universe. There is no need to list them in full, we only note that the principle of the "diagonal" structure of the volume peculiar to 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 accentuated that there is no doubt about Kozlovsky's deep understanding of them. It would be fair to say that all types of Keshokov's spatial models are reflected in translations of his poems. However, as a rule, these are always attempting to fix the "physical" continuum, without its cultural attribution - an attempt to build a virtual space in which, without taking into account the ethnicity of the lyrical "I", his experiences and actions are recorded:

Izvechno zvezdy vestovye

*Glyadyat na doly i hrebtu,
I, kak reklamy svetovye,
CHitayut sud'by s vysoty [...]* (KESHOKOV, 1982, p. 253).
the "pyramidal" model of space;

*Mne slyshen zov minuvshih dnei,
CHto molodoj shumit listvoyu
I nad sedoyu golovoyu
Vdal' gonit oblachnyh konej [...]* (KESHOKOV, 1982, p. 269).
"vector-procedural";

*...I lyudi v nebo vglyadyvat'sya stali,
Uslyshav zhuravlej izdaleka.
Strelyat' po ih klinoobraznoj stae
U gorca ne podnimetsya ruka [...]* (KESHOKOV, 1982, p. 270).
"diagonal", and a number of examples can be continued.

However, there is no ethnic universe, ethnically conscious space in Russian translations (and accordingly in English). Referring to the already cited example of national imagery - "if they shortened the stirrups" - we note that the reason for its "withdrawal" from foreign versions was not a simple ignorance of the rational essence of this Adyghe fighting technique but also a lack of understanding of the topological position of the lyrical hero. Kozlovsky simply did not feel this segment of perceptual space, which is set by the difference in the position of the rider sitting in the saddle and the rider standing up on shortened stirrups to strike. This is the Adyg's microcosm outlined by physiological bodily sensations, which could not be processed by the translator's consciousness.

It is a space of concrete, historically and existentially real national existence, its mentality and vital practices and recreational experience. As shown in many studies, the ethnic structuring of the continuum is directly determined not only by the surrounding landscape (TKHAGAZITOV; TOLGUROV, 2015, p. 274) but also by the methods of management (KUCHUKOVA, 2005, p. 109). In KESHOKOV'S works, it is expressed, as a rule, in poetic representations that carry evolutionarily changed, but 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 epic carried all the semantics of their evolutionary path, including the inherent characteristics of space and time, the chronotopic volume in which these images were realized.

For a foreign cultural recipient, both the specific meaning of the details described and, of course, the continuum they set remained unclear and professional translators, even sensing the informational potential of such expressions, changed it in a way they understood:

Inogda nebo goluboe, na zerkalo pohožhe, Proslavlennyj vsadnik iz gorskogo roda,
Inogda ono stanovitsya (delaetsya) ochen' sinim. Uvenchannyj zvan'em – hranitel' ognya,
YA – starshij sredi chabanov na pastbishche Podderzhival plamya vblizi nebosvoda
I razzhigayu ogon', esli on gasnet. Sred' polnochi chernoj i belogo dnja.

I esli moya iskra ne gasnet k (dostignet) nochi, Koster polyhal i s groznoj v poedinke
Ona – zvezda (kak eshche odin osveshchennyj ob"ekt). Oderzhival verh i osilival t'mu.
I esli putnik stanet moim gostem, I konnyh, i peshih po krucham tropinki
On (mozhet) udivit'sya, chto (koster) ne gasnet. Iz dal'nih storon privodili k nemu.

Odin li ya takoj? I kazhdyj podkladyval v plamya pri etom
Kazhdyj razzhigaet svoj ogon'. Suhie polen'ya, koleni sklonya.
I do tekh por, poka ne nastanut dozhdlivye dni, Sedoj, ozareennyj prorocheskim svetom,
Moj nebol'shoj ogon' dostigaet (sogrevaet) serdca. Sovetom daril vsekh hranitel' ognya.

On osveshchaet nam dorogu, K zemle obrashchennaya likom latunnym,
I ne dayot oshibit'sya nahodyashchemusya v tumane, Luna l' proplyvaet nad grebnymi gor,
Poka on ne dojdjet do konca (ne dogorit), Il' tuchi klubyatsya, mne v mire podlunnom
Oblegchaet gore. Vysokoj poezii viden kostyor.

U nas est' Tihonov – starshij sredi chabanov. Naezdniki, v syodla my prygaem nyne,
Usy ego pohožhi na dve ognennye iskry. I v nebo lyuboj iz nas gonit konya,
Sedlajte, poety, esli (vashi) koni rezvy, Gde v zvyozdnom sosledstve na beloju vershine
Speshite k zarechnym oblakam. ZHiviot sedoglavyj hranitel' ognya
(KESHOKOV, 2004, p. 226; KESHOKOV, 1982, p. 219).

The key in this poem is the image that opens the plot of lyrical empathy – "I am the eldest among shepherds in the pasture // And I light the fire if it goes out."

According to Ya. Kozlovsky, this picture is a symbolic expression that combines numerous hypostases of a cultural hero, up to his ideological modification. The whole European cultural space is permeated with the motif of the civilizing hero, and in translation the whole set of these addresses of the widest range, starting with Prometheus, is felt. It should be noted that at the same time Kozlovsky does not doubt the necessity of constant maintenance of fire – the associative train of the hero-obscurantists presupposes exactly such a nature of actions.

Keshokov writes about the elder shepherd, and his "I light the fire if it goes out" has exactly the opposite meaning – at least in the coordinates of ethnic practices. The senior shepherd is a very real figure of the cattle breeders' collective, responsible, among other things, for the rational use of necessary consumables. He should not constantly burn fuel, he should save it, and I must say that, unlike romantic illusions about this, in reality, fuel on pastures burned for a minimum time. Specifically, this happened in the evening before going to bed in the process of baking bread and cooking for tomorrow and in the morning, in cases when the finished food was heated up, but this was determined by purely rational considerations - at low temperatures.

Thus, the action of the Keshokov's hero is not necessary, but rather unusual. He acts contrary to the norms of production practices established for centuries, putting moral and ethical reasons at the forefront. Gorenje not only focuses on the uniqueness of his hero, but he also concentrates the reader's attention in this way on the very fact of the continuity of the burning of fire, which fully outlines the nationally conscious model of the topos. Although Keshokov has no mention of a koshar - a room for cattle breeders - however, an indication of the upcoming "rainy days" clearly reveals the time and place of action. This is a small space of a mountain Koshara, the isolated volume of which is clear both in terms of its linear dimensions and the light-color gamut consisting of semitones and muted colors of a small unlit room.

Kozlovsky does not have it, which seems quite natural – his generalized cultural "keeper of fire" is localized very approximately ("near the firmament"), and the aesthetic ontology of this image is a kind of center of attraction for others – not everyone, but, in the conditional poetic language of the translator, "kneeling", "gifted with the advice" and so on.

Quite expectedly and naturally Kozlovsky violates the archetypal base of the original Kabardian text. There is no image of a star in translation, – only an abstract "prophetic light" that initiates a centripetal movement that does not have a set direction. Meanwhile, the likening of fire to a star - even in the vague form in which it is observed in the work - is a completely reliable connection with the traditional archetype of the "lone horseman", perhaps the most archaic in Kabardian consciousness. The "star" was one of the stable components of the horseman-warrior archetype, and in the Kabardian poetic world it has always been associated with the motif of the path. The complex of all qualities declared by Keshokov in the image of the "elder shepherd" – "an unquenchable bonfire-star", "illuminated road", "movement through fog" and so on - is unequivocally built into the image of a leader, and at

its base duplicates the stable national image of a warrior leader, the leader of a "zeko" (military raid, campaign).

And the results of the two models of lyrical empathy look completely logical. The translation creates the final image of a mentor-patron, a kind of center of attraction, a spiritual mentor and a spiritual ideal - the movement to heaven is, in Kozlovsky's interpretation, a movement to likening the poets-riders to the "keeper of fire". In the prototype text, the main message is an orderly directional movement. This is an active action, close to a military campaign, and the "senior shepherd" – N. Tikhonov, to whom the poem is dedicated - acts in an attributed role of a warrior-leader, a reference "lone rider" who does not gather around himself, but sets the direction and serves as a behavioral example. This semantic accent of the image is indisputable - Tikhonov's mustache "like two fiery sparks" completely coincides with folklore analogs, emphasizing the aristocracy and military nature of the owner.

The main results of the study can be considered two positions. Firstly, the establishment of the fact of the active participation of non-contextual, substratum-cultural information in the formation of the perceptual model of the perceived poetic text with the corrective role of the author; secondly, the identification of the stability of the semantic content of traditional formants, implying the preservation of the most archaic layers of their information and the consistent accumulation of new meanings.

One of the reasons for neglecting or ignoring the ethnic-cultural substratum was the general dogma of socialist realism. Since the late 50s of the last century, the problems of literary translation have come to the forefront of the world and Soviet literary thought. This has even affected the number of studies devoted to the issues of intercultural translation and interpretation: "[...] In the mid-1960s... the scope of translation activities around the world increased [...] In the decade from 1958 to 1968, the number of books and articles on all forms of translation has increased enormously both in our country and in other countries" (FEDOROV, 2002, p. 7-8). But the very understanding of the "technological" issues of text interpretation in the Soviet Union bore a tangible imprint of the ideological plan.

The traditional philosophy of Marxism-Leninism, systematically declaring the primacy of the material, did not recognize the possibility of literary reconstruction of models of space that possessed perceptual quality. This approach was quite preserved in the 70s of the XX century. In particular, one of the leading art historians of the Soviet Union, M.S. Kagan, generally denied a literary work the presence of a spatial continuum. He did it based on the systematization of the types of arts he developed into "spatial" and "temporal" (KAGAN, 1964, p. 54-56), and, bringing his hypothesis to its logical conclusion, postulated the purely

conventionality and illusory spatial-temporal constructions in the "aesthetic sphere" (KAGAN, 1972, 275).

More moderate views on the virtual continuum of a literary work also denied the topological sense of self-sufficiency and an autonomous information resource, recognizing it only as an emotive beginning and, in essence, reducing the cognitive universe to the rhythm and sequence of the described experiences: "[...] Real-time and space determine the coexistence and change of states of real objects and processes [...] As for perceptual space and time, [...] it is a condition for the coexistence and change of human sensations and other mental acts of the subject" (ZOBOV; MOSTEPANENKO, 1974, p. 11).

There were other points of view, which were based on the idea that the space of a work of art is formed on a subconscious level and has at least two levels of aesthetic cognition - controlled, serving to figuratively express the mental movements of an individual, and autonomous, fixing the real coordinate relationships and basic coordinate dislocations of the author and reader. Nevertheless, the supporters of the coordinate universe in a literary work in their arguments do not go further than denying the versions of their opponents, one way or another proving the penetration of temporal relationships into spatial forms of art, however, being completely unprepared to explain the essence of continuum models in a literary text. They most often bypass this question with a default figure (RHYTHM, SPACE AND TIME IN LITERATURE AND ART, 1974, p. 85-102).

Conclusion. The problem of the adequacy of translation is seen by some experts only in the transmission of allusions to the sphere of presentational culture, which is due to the understanding of the semantics of the image – which is thought of as a kind of textual message, ennobled, and enriched with external associations, although several studies suggest the ethnic specifics of the very structure of figurative representations (TOLGUROV, 2004, p. 273). However, this informative layer of a literary text is not even taken into account when being translated into another language environment, and the main reason for the decline in the artistic level of translation is understood to be ignoring the associative cultural halo (GANIEV, 1964, p. 64). At the same time, it should be borne in mind that cultural and civilizational extensions of the semantics of a poetic object in the perceptual process are essentially nothing more than a synchronic act of intercultural communication. They do not reveal the cross-cutting semantic connections that go into the genetic primitive forms of poetic representations within the framework of one verbal tradition, that is, they do not reveal the information load that provides the ethnic specificity of artistic forms.

And this methodological approach was fixed as the only possible one in the theory of literary translation:

[...] The belonging of the units in question to a certain level or aspect of the language system does not matter at all; the comparison of language units in the theory of translation is made only based on the commonality of the content expressed by them, i.e. the meaning, in other words, based on the semantic community of these units, regardless of their belonging to one or different levels of the language hierarchy (BARKHUDAROV, 1975, p. 27).

Interest in the originality of aesthetic national expression is manifested only at the glossary level, which, is inevitable in a multicultural society, whose different languages are characterized by uneven development and the presence of numerous communicative lacunae in most of them. But here, too, the denotative layer of figurative structures was put as the basis for consideration, and the problem of so-called "non-equivalent" units was seen as a stumbling block in correct interlanguage translation (VERESHCHAGIN; KOSTOMAROV, 1973, p. 52-54). And we must state that by the 60s of the last century, in the sphere of poetic expression, there was practically no equivalent vocabulary in the literal sense of the word in the Kabardian language. However, Russian correspondences to the Adyghe symbolism can only be called complete conditionally. These correspondences are rather hyponymic, and in Russian and Kabardian texts only rational layers of figurative semantics are identical, which do not carry either material specifics or traditional and specific national content (VINOGRADOV, 1978, p. 102).

On the one hand, this is a purely "technological" problem of providing the interpreter with the necessary amounts 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, will not be able to establish in what mode translations of Keshokov's poems were created, what was the information supported from the author. "Technologically", the creation of a translation, in any case, involves familiarity with the author's substrings.

But the absolutely clear picture of the identity of Russian and English texts and the approximation of their correspondence to the national prototype cannot be explained only by the fact that the English poet was familiar only with Russian versions. 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 the archetype of national cultures in general, and verbal ethnic systems in particular (BOROVA, 2021; HAKUASHEVA, 2007).

In the 60s, translation specialists raised questions about the correct transmission of the ethnic specifics of the text, but an essential component of ethnicity was seen as an individual

beginning of poetic expression. In any case, analyzing the translation of one of B. Alykulov's works made by Y. Gordienko, V. Levik noted that "[...] All that deeply personal, individual, and all that national that makes a poem alive, sincere, makes it a work of poetry has disappeared" (LEVIK, 1964, p. 100-101).

Conclusions

Without denying the significance and role of individual talent of passionaries, we still note that the transmission of cross-cutting national archetypes based on epic ethno-aesthetic dominants depends on the paradigmatic state of the sphere of culturally dual poetic representations. 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 national consciousness into the Russian and global civilizational 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 extra-spatial and timeless matrices of myth and epic to the sensory-saturated specifics of materialized representations. However, from the point of view of intercultural communication, Keshokov probably performed a realized, large-scale, but limited task, which consisted in embedding Kabardian poetic thinking in the information and ideological environment of the state. Institutional archetypes of ethnic culture and worldview in their entirety were not necessary for the fulfillment of these adaptive tasks. And it seems quite natural that in foreign language interpretations the texts of A. Keshokov were perceived by the translators precisely within those apperceptive boundaries that were designated by the Kabardian poet himself.

REFERENCES

- ASTVATSATURYAN, E. **Weapons of the Caucasian folks**. Nalchik: Hobbikniga-El-Fa, 1995.
- BARKHUDAROV, L. S. **Languages and translation**: Questions of general and particular theory of translation. Moscow: International Relations, 1975.
- BOROVA, A. R. **Problems of Poetic Translation in the Context of the National Identity of A. Keshokov's Lyrics**. Penza, 2021.
- BRONEVSKY, S. **The latest geographical and historical news about the Caucasus**. Moscow: Selivanovsky's printing house, 1823.

CHUKOVSKY, K. I. **High art**. Leningra: Goslitizdat, 1941.

DAWKINS, R. **The Selfish Gene**. London: Granada, 1978.

DERZHAVIN, G. R. **Essays**. Saint Petersburg: Publishing House of Imp. AN, 1872.

FEDOROV, A. V. **Fundamentals of the general theory of translation (linguistic problems)**. St. Petersburg: Faculty of Philology of St. Petersburg State University, 2002.

FOUCAULT, M. **Les Mots et les Choses**. Une archeology des sciences humaines. Paris: Gallimard, coll. «Bibliothèque des sciences humaines», 1966.

GANIEV, V. **Imagery as an element of accuracy**. Moscow: Soviet writer, 1964.

HAKUASHEVA, M. A. **Literary archetypes in the artistic works of Adyghe writers**. Nalchik: Publishing House of the KBSC RAS, 2007.

HEIDEGGER, M. **Being and time**. Kharkiv: Folio, 2003.

JASPERS, K. **Philosophy of language and semiotics**. Ivanovo: IvSu, 1995.

JUNG, K. **Archetype and symbol**. Moscow: Renaissance IV Evo, 1991.

KAGAN, M. S. **Lectures on Marxist-Leninist aesthetics**. Leningrad: LSU Publishing House, 1964.

KAGAN, M. S. **Morphology of art**: Historical and theoretical study of the internal structure of the world of arts. Leningrad: Art, 1972.

KAZHAROVA, I. A. **Kabardian poetry of the twentieth century**: Actualization of the ideal. Nalchik: LLC Printing Yard, 2014.

KESHOKOV, A. P. **Brand (in kab.lang)**. Nalchik: Elbrus, 1969.

KESHOKOV, A. P. **Sobranie sochinenii**. Moscow: Fiction, 1982.

KESHOKOV, A. P. **Sobranie sochinenii**: Poems and poems (in kab.lang). Nalchik: Elbrus, 2004.

KESHOKOV, A. P. **Starry hour**. Moscow: Progress, 1981.

KUCHUKOVA, Z. A. **Ontological metacode as the core of ethnopoetics**. Nalchik: Publishing house of M. and V. Kotlyarov, 2005.

LANGLE, A. **Person**: Existential-analytical theory. Moscow: Progress, 2005.

LEVIK, V. **The right word is not the right place**: Masters of translation. Moscow: Soviet writer, 1964.

PARSONS, T.; BALES, R. **Family, socialization and interaction process**. New York: The Three University Press, 1955.

PUSHKIN, A. S. **Full**. Aquarius. OEM. Leningrad: Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1949.

PUSHKIN, A.S. **Essays**. St. Petersburg, 1838.

RHYTHM, SPACE AND TIME IN LITERATURE AND ART. Collection of articles. Leningrad: Science, 1974.

SHCHERBA, L.V. **Experiments of linguistic interpretation of poems**. Lermontov's "Pine" in comparison with its German prototype. Leningrad: Publishing house of the Leningrad Research Institute of Linguistics, 1936.

STOLYAROV, M. P. The art of translating fiction. **Literary critic**, n. 5-6, p. 249, 1939.

TKHAGAZITOV, YU. M.; TOLGUROV, T. Z. Topological formants of the ethical and aesthetic consciousness of Kabardians and Balkarians. **Humanities, socio-economic and social sciences**, v. 2, n. 11, p. 281, 2015.

TOLGUROV, T. Z. **Evolution of tissue figurative structures in the newly written poetic systems of the North Caucasus**. Nalchik: El-Fa, 2004.

VERESHCHAGIN, E. M.; KOSTOMAROV, V. G. **Language and culture**. Linguistics in teaching Russian as a foreign language. Moscow: Publishing House of Moscow State University, 1973.

VINOGRADOV, V. S. **Lexical issues of translation of fiction**. Moscow: Publishing House of Moscow State University, 1978.

VINOGRADOV, V. V. **Pushkin's language**. Leningrad: Academia, 1935.

ZHUKOVSKY, V. A. **Essays in verse and prose**. Saint Petersburg: Glazunov's edition, 1901.

ZOBOV, R. A.; MOSTEPANENKO, A. M. **On the typology of space-time relations in the field of art**. Leningrad: Nauka, 1974.

How to reference this article

BOROVA, A. R.; TIMIZHEV, K. T.; BOZIEVA, N. B.; KHUL'CHAEVA, M. K.; BITOKOVA, M. V. Transitivity of stable symbolism of adyghe poetry (works of A. Keshokov). **Rev. EntreLinguas**, Araraquara, v. 8, n. esp. 1, e022017, Mar. 2022. e-ISSN: 2447-3529. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29051/el.v8iesp.1.16928>

Submitted: 23/11/2021

Required revisions: 16/01/2022

Approved: 27/02/2022

Published: 30/03/2022