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This paper focuses on paratextual elements in the form of endnotes and footnotes in four annotated English translations of Mikhail Bulgakov’s most famous novel, *The Master and Margarita*. The paper aims to analyze the translators’ perception of the reader’s cultural knowledge, what the translators believe the audience might not know that they consider important, and the translators’ ability to recognize Bulgakov’s allusions and references. The paper explores the thematic categories and the content of the notes to evaluate how they introduce the readers to a different cultural environment and to what extent the notes are helpful to the reader. The empirical section is based on an analysis of more than five hundred footnotes and endnotes divided into thematic categories. The importance of notes in understanding translators’ decisions based on assumptions about what may be unfamiliar to the target audience has been extensively researched (Toledano-Buendia 2013; Landers 2001; Sanchez Ortiz 2015; Pellatt 2013). No scholarly attention has so far been paid to any paratextual material connected to the English translations of Bulgakov’s *The Master and Margarita*, which is one of the most often retranslated works of fiction of Russian classics.
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I. Introduction

This comparative corpus analysis is based on paratextual elements in the form of footnotes, endnotes, and comments, in English translations of Mikhail Bulgakov’s most famous novel, *The Master and Margarita*. The novel was translated into English six times by Ginsburg (1957, republished in 1995), Glenny (first translation published in 1967 and later republished in 1971/1985/1988/1989); Burgin and
O’Connor (1995); Pevear and Volokhonsky (first published in 1997 and later republished in 2000/2001/2004/2006/2007); Karpelson (2006, republished in 2011), and Aplin (2008). The initial translations by Ginsburg and Glenny, including republished versions, were not annotated. At the same time, para-
textual practices changed significantly in subsequent translations by Burgin and O’Connor, Pevear and Volokhonsky, Karpelson and Aplin. The reasons I have chosen the notes to the English translations of The Master and Margarita as a corpus is, firstly, because it is one of only a few works of Russian literature that have been retranslated into English more than twice as well as been annotated, thus offering extensive material for a comparative case study. To my knowledge, no scholarly attention has been paid to any paratextual material connected to the English translations of Bulgakov’s prose. A corpus of notes is relatively straightforward to compile. It can serve a variety of research topics, opening further discussion on the use of paratextual material in translations of Russian classics.

Notes can be produced with or without awareness of pre-existing translations and the notes they included. Their importance is undeniable, as they enable an identifiable interaction between the text and the reader, acting as a text in its own right. They frame the text for the target-culture reader, guide the receiver’s response and interpretation, and make the translator’s voice heard as he or she speaks directly to the reader. Hence, they do not reveal what the audience knew or did not know; instead, they tell us what the translator believes their audience might not know that he or she considers important. Notes thus provide a window into translators’ perceptions of their audience, as notes are one of the ways through which the translator can address “the gap in the target readers’ knowledge of the source-language culture” (Landers, 2001, 93).

It is the task of a translator to evaluate to what extent the target text recipient can understand cultural nuances, and notes help “to make the reading experience of the target reader as close as possible to the experience of the source text reader” (Sousa 2002, 18–19).³

Bulgakov’s The Master and Margarita is a dual-dimensional work set in two different times and cultures, the Soviet autocratic regime in Moscow and the

---

1. Notes by a translator can also be altered in later editions as a result of deceptive practices within the publishing industry. I checked other editions and found that the notes were the same in all of them. However, to avoid any possible inaccuracies, the empirical data for the analysis were taken from the first editions of all four translations.

2. Both translations were published in the same year in different countries, Ginsburg’s in the United States and Glenny’s in England, and both publishers rejected the translators’ notes.

3. The results of the analysis demonstrated that the choice of footnoted and endnoted did not depend on the translators’ choice of domesticated or foreignized strategies.
Jewish under Roman occupation in an apocryphal account of Christ’s crucifixion in an imaginary city of Jerushalaim. It is sated with various cultural, philosophical, mythological, musical, literal, and socio-political elements of both realities. The present study analyzes a corpus of more than 500 footnotes and endnotes in English translations, which will be categorized into thematic categories. The main purpose of the research is to explore the content of the notes and to evaluate how they introduce the readers to a different cultural environment. I also aim to explore what the notes entail for the reader’s understanding and perception of Bulgakov’s narrative and to compare thematic categories in various translations to discover which tendencies, differences, or similarities occur over more than sixty years.

Drawing on existing theories in the translation field, the paper seeks to develop a conceptual framework that has broader applicability for the analysis of this type of paratexts in numerous translations and retranslations of Russian and Soviet classics (e.g., 13 translations of Dostoyevsky’s Crime and Punishment, 10 translations of Tolstoy’s War and Peace, 17 translations of Turgenev’s Fathers and Sons, etc.).

II. Theoretical background

Exploring this area of translation studies, scholars tend to focus on a specific type of paratext – in most cases, on notes and prefaces.4 Several studies have been carried out concerning the functions and conceptual implications of paratexts, specifically in the narrative genre (Gennette and Maclean 1991, Kovala 1996, Tahir-Gürçaglar 2002), including children’s literature (Watts 2000; Yustre Frías 2012), plays (Jorge Braga Riera 2018), and poetry (Pellatt 2013, Stratford and Jolicoeur 2014) (Riera 2018, 251). Hence, as my analysis focuses specifically on notes, other types of paratexts, such as prefaces, indices, and glossaries, will not be discussed here.

All types of notes remain common paratextual instruments in literary translations, and their functions expand beyond merely an explanatory apparatus that facilitates readers’ comprehension. It is essential to remember that while notes help explain certain historical and cultural elements to target readers, they need to represent what readers do not know fully. Instead, notes indicate the trans-

4. Translations of The Master and Margarita into English and other languages have been research by Kaloh Vid (2016, 2017, 2018), Lenart (2017, translations into English and Hungarian), May (1998, analysis of Ginsbr’s, Glenny’s and Burgin and O’Connor’s translations), and Zakhrestiian (2019, analysis of English and Polish translations).
lator’s beliefs and assumptions regarding what readers do not know (Kovala, 1996; Paloposki, 2010). Paloposki (2010), Toledano-Buendia (2013), and Sanchez Ortiz (2015) have analyzed notes provided by translators. In the research on footnotes in Finnish translations from 1870–1929, Paloposki (2010, 87) asserts that footnotes are “the one spot in the translation that is clearly the translator’s own voice,” and that a study of these paratextual elements in various genres can offer information about the translators’ expectations and speculations about their future readers’ cultural knowledge. Sanchez Ortiz (2015) explored the use of notes in literary translations from English into Spanish. Similarly, Paloposki concludes that the use of footnotes depends on the translators’ judgment of the needs of their target readers. Finally, Toledano Buendía (2013, 150–151) speaks about notes in a more general way, that is, as “statements of variable length that are always connected to more or less definite segments of the text and that are usually found printed at the bottom of the page or in its margins, although they can also be included at the end of each chapter or book.” The current analysis implies Toledano-Buendia’s classification of translator notes: (1) explanatory or factual notes that supplement the text and that have an informative function, and (2) discursive or interpretative notes that serve a performative function and express the translator’s opinions and attitudes (Toledano-Buendia, 2013, 156–161).

One debate in translation studies that continues to reverberate is whether to use footnotes in a translation. Footnotes are the most visible paratexts in a translation (even if the translator’s arguments, aims, and processes behind the footnote are hidden). Their visibility is the problem with accepting footnotes because “they leap to the eye” (Henry 239 qtd. in Paloposki 2010, 98) and are often viewed as a translator’s failure to find an equivalent or to convey the message of the original properly. The notes can arguably prevent the reader from enjoying the pleasure of the text, as they interrupt the reading process. While Nida (1965, 237–39) advocates the use of footnotes as they provide much-needed supplementary information for the readers and call attention to the original’s discrepancies, Pym (1992, 89) argues that “[n]otes are expansion by another name.” He opposes the use of notes, insisting that it is an insult to the target readers’ intelligence, claiming that the translator can resort to other methods to handle the content of notes. Lenders also criticizes footnotes because he says that they “destroy the memetic effect, the attempt of most creative writers to create an allusion that the reader is actually witnessing, if not experiencing the events described” (2001, 93).

5. Only one of four English translations of *The Master and Margarita*, by Karpelson, used footnotes, while the others used endnotes, which are similar to footnotes, content-wise, but, being situated at the end of the book, tend to be more reader-friendly.
III. The notes’ structure in English translations of *The Master and Margarita*

The corpus used in this analysis consists of 569 comments. The distribution of notes is uneven, with Burgin and O’Connor’s translation containing the highest number of notes at 210, Pevear and Volokhonsky’s 176, Karpelson’s 53, and Aplin’s 130.

Diana Burgin and Katherine Tiernan O’Connor (1995)

This translation, published in the United States, was the first annotated translation of the novel. The allographic notes, prepared by Ellendea Proffer, a well-known Bulgakov expert, translator and publisher, vary in length from one up to twenty lines. In the introduction, Proffer states that “these notes are not intended to be exhaustive; names which are easily looked up in any encyclopaedia are not glossed. The emphasis is rather on difficult references, especially Russian ones, and on information that will send the reader in the direction of possible subtexts in this novel” (1995, 337). Proffer emphasizes one of the most important characteristics of Bulgakov’s prose, allusions, which send his readers to various biblical, literary, musical, mythological, musical or historical pre-texts. If the future reader of *The Master and Margarita* does not recognize some of the allusions, it should not significantly influence his or her perception as, “it is usually possible to read and understand the alluding text without activating the allusion, but this obviously means losing the enriching connotations” (Ben-Porat 1975, 115). Hence, if too many allusions remain unrecognized, the reader’s interpretative coordinates may be significantly shifted. Leppihalme believes that recognition of the source of key-phrase allusions depends on familiarity as, “if the reader has heard a phrase repeatedly since childhood, read it in books, heard it in churches, at school, in songs, in films and television programs, etc., then s/he will easily recognize it and its sources” (Leppihalme 1997, 85). In translation, this kind of familiarity does not exist. Translating novels like *The Master and Margarita* which contain a high number of pre-texts is complicated, “since the connotations of the allusions may not be activated in the reading process, the readers of the translation cannot understand much of a number of allusions, even if the source is given” (Leppihalme 1997, 110). In cases like this, explanations (and not only listing sources of allusions) contribute to a more successful interpretation. Proffer’s notes demonstrate the highest number of discursive or interpretative notes and the future reader is also offered possible interpretations, for example, the note on the “threesome” in the fourth chapter. The reader is not only informed that the unholy trinity are Woland, the choirmaster and the cat,
but also that “there are many details here which are allusions to events of the New Testament’s events which are not described in the Pilate chapters, but which are given in parodic form in the Moscow chapters, a pattern which will continue throughout” (1995, 342).

The notes take the form of endnotes, which are formatted in bold and listed by chapter. They are not numbered in the narrative, which makes them difficult to follow, but, as a result of such distribution, the endnotes corpus can be read as an entirely separate text.

Number: 210

Richard Pevear and Larisa Volokhonsky (1997)

This translation was also published in the United States. As is outlined in the introduction, the notes were prepared by the translators. They occur in the form of endnotes, are formatted in italics and listed by chapter. The length varies from one up to eleven lines. The notes are explanatory or factual. There is only one note that can be classified as discursive or interpretative. The notes are subsequently numbered in the text of the translation, which makes it easier for the reader to follow.

Number: 176

Michael Karpelson (2006)

This translation was published in Canada. It has the lowest number of notes, which are divided into two types: footnotes and comments provided in the “Extended Commentary” chapter at the end of the translation. It is unclear and unexplained what parameters Karpelson used to divide the notes into these categories. Both types are included in the analysis. All notes were prepared by Karpelson and he explained that “I felt that having to rely constantly on footnotes and reference material would be detrimental to the reading experience. As a result, commentary within the text itself is kept to a minimum and used mostly to explain necessary historical details” (2006). Footnotes are numbered, while extended comments appear at the end of the translation, are formatted in italics and listed by chapter. The footnotes are one to two lines long; the length of extended comments varies from one up to seven lines. Karpelson also explained in the “Extended commentary” chapter that,

These notes provide background for some of the characters, locations, and events in *The Master and Margarita*. It is beyond the scope of this document to explain all of Bulgakov’s numerous references and sources, particularly those that can be
Some of the concepts that Karpelson assumed would be unfamiliar to foreign readers (culturally-specific linguistic items such as NKVD, communal apartment, torgsin, etc.) are explained in the two page introduction, “A Five Minute Primer on Bulgakov’s Russia,” which he strongly recommends to the reader. No other translator used this paratextual strategy whereby information that would normally be found in the notes was placed in the introduction. The question naturally arises whether readers would be able to fully understand these concepts out of context and later recall their meanings.

Karpelson’s explanation regarding his choice of content in footnotes and comments is the most extensive. He explained his paratextual strategies in several places. His main motivation seems to be to make a clear distinction from the previous two translations. Karpelson is also the only translator who signified that “My principal goal with this translation has been to improve readability as much as possible without sacrificing accuracy” (2006, 309). This reveals a clear intention to “improve” previous translations, though Karpelson did not mention which (if any) translations he read. The footnotes and comments are informative or factual, and only one note can be classified as discursive or interpretative.

Number of comments: 37
Number of footnotes: 16
Together: 53

Hugh Aplin (2008)

This translation was published in England, with notes prepared by the translator. They are not numbered in the text and occur in the form of endnotes, formatted in italics and listed by page and not by chapter. Aplin did not give any explanation regarding his choice of content for the notes. The length of the notes varies from one to a maximum of five lines. All notes are explanatory or factual.

Number: 129

Common notes

Given the extensive number of footnotes and comments, I decided to contextually analyze only those elements explained in all four translations, as these elements were perceived by all translators and by Proffer to be unfamiliar to the future
Fifteen notes appeared in all four translations: the epigraph from Goethe’s Faust, the explanations of three Sovietisms, the pseudonym of one of the main characters, a culturally-specific term, references to famous historical personalities, a reference to a song and a reference to a historical monument.

The novel opens with a quote from Johann von Goethe’s drama Faust “…Так что же ты наконец? Я часть той самой силы, что вечно хочет зла и вечно совершает благо”/Tak što že tu nakonc? Â čast’ toj samoj sily, što večno hočet zla i večno soveršaet blago (Bulgakov 1990, 7) translated as “… and so who are you, after all? – I am part of the power which forever wills evil and forever works good.” In the epigraph, Bulgakov alerts the reader to the importance of understanding the relationship between his work and Goethe’s Faust and, more specifically, the Faustian devil. According to Toledano-Buendia, translators choose to explain those elements, which, in their opinion, “may result in a different or incorrect interpretation of the translation.” The translator intervenes by way of the notes and offers his or her point of view so as to ensure that the text is correctly interpreted and understood by target readers (Toledano-Buendia 2013, 159). The reader is provided with explanations in all four translations, considering the epigraph’s importance for the novel’s intertextual interpretation, as Margarita enters a pact with Woland to save her lover, the Master, in a direct intertextual reference to Faust.

In an interpretative note to Burgin and O’Connor’s translation, Proffer extensively explains Faustian elements in Bulgakov’s novel. Pevear and Volokhonsky summarize essential information about the epigraph’s source in a short factual note: “The epigraph comes from the scene entitled “Faust’s Study” in the first part of the drama Faust by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1842). The question is asked by Faust; the answer comes from the demon Mephistopheles” (1995, 397). Karpelson’s comment also links Bulgakov’s novel to Faust and classifies it as interpretative: “There are many ties to Goethe’s Faust throughout the novel, including the names and attributes of several characters, references to locations, and quotes inserted in the text” (2006, 309). Aplin’s note is factual and includes only basic information on the source: “The quotation is from the “Faust’s Study” scene from part 1 of the drama Faust (1808–32) by J.W. von Goethe (1749–1832), lines 1334–36” (2008, 404).

Three Sovietisms, lexical items characteristic of Soviet discourse in the 1930s, are explained in all four translations: “Соловки”/ Solovki (Bulgakov 1990, 13).

---

6. As the results demonstrate, the length of the comments is not a crucial factor in “conveying verifiable and objective information” (Toledano-Buendia 2013, 157).

7. For the sake of clarity, these common notes are also included in the further analysis of other comments.
translated as Solovky, “МАССОЛИТ”/ MASSOLIT (Bulgakov 1990, 15) translated as MASSOLIT and “торгсин”/ torgsin (Bulgakov 1990, 337) translated as torgsin. The meaning of these terms is unclear from the context. The first one, explained in all four translations, is Massolit, the name of a fictional literary association that may be deciphered as “mass literature.” The term occurs at the beginning of Chapter 1. It is a fake Sovietism, a word coined by Bulgakov to parody prevalent linguistic processes, such as the coining of Soviet neologisms by combining syllables from different words.8

In Burgin and O’Connor’s translation, Proffer offers another interpretative note, which expresses the opinion that this is “a very funny acronym in Russian, which might be best conveyed in English as LOTSALIT” (1995, 338). In my view, the claim that the contraction sounds “very funny” in Russian is an exaggeration – “literature for the masses” was a common and positive notion of the times. The jocular “translation” of Bulgakov’s invented name (OTALIT) in the comment is funny though and certainly expresses Bulgakov’s irony in relation to the concept of (real) literature being produced **en masse**. Proffer also clarifies that this was a fake Sovietism: “Bulgakov found the Soviet passion for acronyms very funny and made up various absurd ones throughout his career, although the real ones were bizarre enough” (1995, 338).

Pevear and Volokhonsky offer a short factual comment with information on other such linguistic formations in the novel: “An invented but plausible contraction parodying the many contractions introduced in post-revolutionary Russia. There will be others further on – Dramlit House (House for Dramatists and Literary Workers), findirector (financial director), and so on” (1997, 397). It should be noted that Massolit is not a contraction but an acronym.

Karpelson’s note in the form of a final comment (and not a footnote) is similar and also mentions the parody aspect, explaining that Massolit was “a fictional organization that parodies the odd-sounding acronyms and contractions prevalent in Soviet times (a few more of these appear later in the novel)” (2006, 309). In Aplin’s translation, we read only that “the organization is an invention of Bulgakov’s” (2008, 404).

Karpelson’s note explains the crucial reference to parody as well as the meaning of this word-formation, placing it in a historical context. Pevear and Volokhonsky’s note gives the reader some information about the linguistic features of Soviet language but fails to explain the denotative meaning of the term. Aplin’s note explains that Bulgakov invented the term, leaving the meaning and textual function aside.

8. This is not the only fake Sovietism in the novel.
Another common Sovietism explained in all four translations is Solovki, a nickname for the Solovetsky Special Purpose Camp. The term is introduced in Chapter 1, when the poet Bezdomny proclaims that the philosopher Immanuel Kant should be sent to Solovki, because of his philosophical argument claiming that God’s existence is demonstrable. As in the previous case, Proffer is the only translator who used an interpretative note, describing and interpreting the historical context and mentioning that “there is another level in this reference, one which fits in with one of the main subtexts of this novel” (1995, 339). Her explanation adds to the interpretative possibilities of the novel, as later in the text, the Master is called “a Militant Old Believer” by a literary critic, and Solovki, as they point out, once harbored many Old Believers who were eventually massacred. This happened to many Solovki inmates, whom the Soviets regarded as enemies of the state. Other translators used short factual notes. In this case, recreation of the original’s situational irony can only be achieved if the reader fully understands what this Sovietism means. Otherwise, Bulgakov’s irony in Bezdomny thinking that Kant is a criminal who should be punished for questioning atheism, the anti-religious foundation of the Soviet state, may get lost.

The third and final Sovietism explained in all four translations is “torgsin,” a shop that offered a great variety of goods in exchange for foreign currency. The term appears at the end of the novel, in Chapter 28. Proffer’s note is the longest and refers to Bulgakov’s own experience with torgsins. Pevear and Volokhonsky also explain the meaning of the term thoroughly and provide the information that Bulgakov could avail himself of this privilege, while Karpelson and Aplin offer short factual notes. Karpelson’s footnote explains that “these currency stores were limited to foreigners and those few Russians who were allowed access to foreign currency” (2006, 271). Aplin commented that the word is a contraction for “trade with foreigners,” which is a broad term and does not fully illustrate the purpose and nature of torgsins. The term, an exclusively Soviet phenomenon, was transliterated in all four translations, and the note then channels relevant cultural knowledge to the reader.

The next common note refers to the pseudonym of one of the protagonists, the poet Ivan Ponyryov, who follows the example of other proletarian writers and poets and takes the pseudonym “Бездомный”/ Bezdomnyj (Bulgakov 1990, 13) translated as Bezdomny Homeless). Bezdomnyj’s name has a denotative meaning in Russian, which can only be understood by native speakers or a reader who understands some Russian. Burgin and O’Connor use the transliteration Bezdomny. Proffer explains the meaning of the original Homeless in an extensive note, referring to other famous pseudonyms, such as Gorky and Bedny. The note is interpretative, as Proffer offers clear interpretative coordinates when stating that “Bulgakov’s main characters tend to be a blend of many sources and sometimes are
deliberate abstractions (the Master himself is a good example of this). Minor characters, however, tend to have recognizable sources in a single figure” (1995, 338).

Pevear and Volokhonsky use the literal translation *Homeless* when rendering the name. Their note also mentions other proletarian writers who “adopted such pen-names,” such as Efim Pridvorov, who called himself Demian Bedny (“Poor”), the author of violently anti-religious poetry (1997, 397). The note is interpretative, as readers are told that “It may have been the reading of Bedny that originally sparked Bulgakov’s impulse to write *The Master and Margarita*” (1997, 397). In Karpelson’s version, the name is translated literally as *Homeless*, and a short factual note mentions that “such pen names were popular among Soviet writers and poets” (2006, 309). Aplin used the transliteration *Bezdomny*, offering a brief factual note that does not refer to any other literary figures of Bulgakov’s time but merely informs the reader that it is a “Poet’s pseudonym, meaning ‘homeless’” (2008, 404).

Another term explained in all four translations is “старообрядец”/staroobрядец (Bulgakov 1990, 134), translated as “Old Believer,” which appears in a dialogue between the Master and Ivan Bezdomny, and refers to the negative responses the Master receives from the Soviet critics after trying to publish his novel on Pontius Pilate. One of them labels the Master an “Old Believer,” originally a member of a group of Russian religious dissenters who refused to accept the liturgical reforms imposed upon the Russian Orthodox Church. The designation “Old Believer” is used by the Soviet literary establishment with the purpose of denouncing the Master as a “fanatic retrograde.” Bulgakov uses the term in two ironic ways, pointing to the historical-cultural ignorance of Soviet critics who bandy about a term they do not understand as long as it seems to contain a critique of the past and those who use it incriminatingly-propagandistically if they do know what the term stands for. In Burgin and O’Connor’s translation, the historical content of the term is explained in a note about Solovki work camp, and Proffer only briefly refers to the “reform in religious practices” (1995, 348). Pevear and Volokhonsky explain that “the Old Believers broke with the Russian Orthodox Church in the mid-seventeenth century, in protest against the reforms of the patriarch Nikon. The term is used rather loosely by Latusky.” The translators also refer to Bulgakov’s personal experience of being attacked as “a militant white guard” (1995, 405). Karpelson follows Pevear and Volokhonsky’s note almost word by word, also mentioning that Bulgakov was labelled a “Belligerent White Guardsman.” Aplin’s short note informs the reader that this was “the name given to those who separated from the Russian Orthodox church” (2008, 407).

All notes are factual. The term requires knowledge of the history of this religious schism which, in all translators’ opinions, could be problematic for a future reader. Surprisingly, while historically informative and accurate, all of these notes
lack the important detail that the fictional critic uses the term as an insult, referring to the religious content of the Master’s novel.

A few common notes appear in Chapter 23, which features the Great Satan’s Ball, where Margarita must greet an endless number of guests, all of whom are historical personalities who have committed heinous crimes. The names of the guests are explained in notes in all four translations, including “Господин Жак”/Gospodin Žak (Bulgakov 1990, 257) Monsieur Jacques, “Граф Роберт”/Graf Robert (Bulgakov 1990, 257) Earl (Count) Robert, “Госпожа Тофана”/ Gospoža Tofana (Bulgakov 1990, 258) Madam (Signora) Tofana, a fictional character named “Фрида”/Frida (Bulgakov 1990, 258) Frida who strangled her own child (a reference to Goethe’s Gretchen), “маркиза”/markiza (Bulgakov 1990, 258) the Marquise (a reference to the Marquise de Brinvilliers), “Госпожа Минкина”/Gospoža Minkina (Bulgakov 1990, 261) Madam (Lady) Minkina, “император Рудольф”/Imperator Rudolf (Bulgakov 1990, 262) Emperor Rudolf and “Малюта”/Malûta (Bulgakov 1990, 262) Maliuta (Malyta) Skuratov. Some sections of this chapter are constructed as a dialogue between Margarita and Woland’s servant Koroviev, who explains to her who the guests are and what crimes they committed. Koroviev refers to these historical personalities by first name, occasionally combined with their titles, which makes it challenging for the reader to recognize them. All notes in this category are factual.

All four translations also explain “Славное море, священый Байкал”/Glorious Sea, Sacred Baikal,” a prison song about Lake Baikal, in Siberia. The lines from the song appear in Chapter 17 when a group of workers in the Commission for Spectacle and Entertainment, enchanted by Koroviev, involuntarily begin to sing and cannot stop singing. The lines are translated word-for-word in all four translations. The ironic connotations should be explained here. During their visit to Moscow, Woland and his servants punish immoral acts such as greed, condemnation, cruelty, and bribery. The whole chapter is then constructed around an ironic situation that Members of the Commission, who otherwise do not need to work hard, being a part of a complex Soviet bureaucratic mechanism of various commissions and committees, are punished by being made to sing a song historically associated with hard labor. Proffer’s note is interpretative, stating that “it became politically correct after the revolution” (1995, 349), placing the song in a broader historical context. The other translators offer short factual notes. The ironic effect may be lost if the readers are unfamiliar with the song’s content. All four factual notes explain that convicts commonly sang the song during hard labor, and it remained popular throughout the Soviet period.

Finally, the reference to the « на постаменте металлический человек »/na postamente metalličeskiĭ čelovek (Bulgakov 1990, 73) translated as Metal
Man on a Pedestal (a statue of Alexander Pushkin in Moscow) is also explained in all four translations. In Chapter 6, the jealous second-rate poet Riukhin looks at the statue of Pushkin and broods about what he did to become so famous, as Riukhin believes there is nothing special in his poetry. He concludes that Pushkin must have become famous because he was shot by a member of the white guard, a reference to Baron Georges-Charles de Heeckeren d’Anthès, who fatally wounded Pushkin during a duel. As the name Pushkin is not mentioned in this passage, it is up to the reader to make this connection; Pevear and Volokhonsky offer a factual note that explains the reference to “the white guard,” the fact that Pushkin was killed in a duel and the connection to Mayakovsky’s poem “Jubilee,” written on the 125th anniversary of Pushkin’s birth. Proffer’s note is interpretative, as apart from explaining Bulgakov’s rivalry with Mayakovsky, it also offers Proffer’s interpretation of the character of Ryukhin, who is “of such primitive culture that he refers to the man who killed Pushkin in a duel in 1837 as a white guard” (1995, 344). Karpelson only offers information that Pushkin “died of a fatal wound during a duel” (2006, 55), while Aplin’s factual notes are very short and this one is no exception as readers are informed that “this is the statue of Pushkin” (2008, 406).

As these examples demonstrate, Proffer used interpretative notes which not only explain the context but also “are used by the translator to express his or her own views and opinion” (Toledano-Buendia 2013, 157) in all cases, apart from the category of historical personalities. Pevear and Volokhonsky and Karpelson used two interpretative notes and Aplin none. Proffer’s comments offer the reader information not only on presumably unknown cultural elements but also on the novel’s content, possible interpretations, intertextual links, social and historical discourses, which make them more profound and useful than the other translators.

IV. Thematic fields

The notes can be divided into the following thematic fields:

Table 1. Thematic fields

1. The Bible: (a) biblical places; (b) biblical quotes (especially from the Book of Revelation); (c) biblical personalities

One of the most important pre-texts for Bulgakov is the Bible, especially the Book of Revelation. Bulgakov employs numerous quotes from the Bible and various passages from the Book of Revelation, biblical places and personalities when describing events in the novel and constructing the settings of both Moscow and Yershalaim.
Table 1. (continued)

2. **Sovietisms** and terms related to Soviet discourse

The term **Sovietisms** refers to lexical items characteristic of Soviet discourse in the 1930s; they are word-formations of “Soviet Russian.” Bulgakov’s language is saturated with Soviet vocabulary referring to various cultural and socio-political elements of Soviet reality. **Sovietisms** occur at various levels (lexical, syntactic, stylistic and rhetorical) and should be carefully considered by translators as being a significant characteristic of Bulgakov’s style.

3. references to: (a) Russian literary works and (b) foreign literary works

Many literary scholars and critics have taken upon themselves the demanding task of wending their way through religious, socio-historical and literary references in the novel, as one of the most important features of Bulgakov’s style is intertextuality. In the novel, he employs numerous allusions and references to Russian classics, including those of Pushkin, Gogol, Lermontov, Tolstoy and foreign literary works, primarily by Goethe and Schiller. The novel is thus embedded in Russian and global literary culture.

4. gods and divinities

Most names of gods that occur in the novel are of Egyptian and Greek origin.

5. word-plays

This category is represented in only two translations by Burgin and O’Connor and Pevear and Volokhonsky. In both translations the Russian original is provided in italics followed by an explanation of the word’s meaning in Russian and how it was transferred into English.

6. musical references

Bulgakov incorporates musical allusions to composers, compositions and famous Russian songs which accompany and colour the action.

7. Cultural-specific terms: (a) Russian and (b) foreign

Culturally specific terms include food, drinks (wine and champaign) and clothes items.

8. explanations of personal names of the characters

Most personal names in the novel reflect (a) references to other literary works (Margarita), (b) biblical names (Azzazello), (c) humorous names (Varenukha), (d) names with a denotative meaning in Russian (Bosoi).

9. geographic locations

Topography plays an important role in framing both plots and Bulgakov describes Moscow and Yershalaïm with an unassailable accuracy.

10. religious traditions

Bulgakov’s irony is often constructed on joining polarly different discourses to achieve a surprise effect. One of such methods is the use of references to services in the Orthodox church, such as baptism or church wedding, when depicting an everyday Soviet atheistic reality.
Table 1. (continued)

11. foreign words

In *The Master and Margarita*, Bulgakov occasionally used words from German, French and Yiddish to increase the dramatic effect.

12. historic events

There are several historic events explained, including the Russian Civil War and the Spanish Civil War.

13. buildings and monuments

Buildings and monuments are linked to spatial topography. Bulgakov often uses virtual routes to create a certain effect for readers, such as a sense of anxiety in the fourth chapter when we follow Ivan Bezdomny’s aimless and quick pace through Moscow’s streets next to the garden ring.

14. explanations of inconsistencies and errors

According to Marietta Chudakova, the manuscript of *The Master and Margarita*, written between 1928 and 1940, contains eight successive versions (redactions) of the novel (some of them remained unfinished and some were destroyed) (1978: 180). The main text was almost completed in 1938, but Bulgakov continued making corrections up until a few months before his death. For this reason, there are several significant discrepancies in the text that would have been amended if Bulgakov had had time to revise the complete text. *

15. historic personalities

Numerous historic personalities from various countries and epochs occur in the novel and can be divided into: (a) philosophers, (b) musicians, (c) members of royal families, (d) famous historic criminals (in the chapter which depicts a Great Satan’s Ball) and (e) writers.

16. oblique references to arrest and the secret police

Bulgakov was aware of the Soviet censorship and references to arrests in the novel are well-hidden between the lines, e.g. mentioning that people started disappearing, the seal on the door, or that Master had no buttons on his coat as it was customary to remove buttons and belts from those arrested or kept for questioning.

17. explanations of solar and lunar themes

Solar and lunar themes multiply in the novel and some characters (e.g. Pontius Pilate) are tortured by the sun or the moon.

* The novel was first published in the Soviet Union in 1966 and 1967 with significant censorial cuts amounting to some sixty typed pages.

The table below indicates that Burgin and O’Connor and Pevear and Volokhonsky’s translations contain a large number of notes compared to Karpelson’s and Aplin’s. I did not find any indication that the publishers of either translation actively promoted addition strategies as a guiding norm, though this assumption could certainly be true. Karpelson and Aplin approached the issue of notes in a different way, by de-emphasizing addition strategies.
Table 2. Categories that are annotated in Burgin and O’Connor’s, Pevear and Volokhonsky’s, Karpelson’s and Aplin’s translations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Burgin and O’Connor/ endnotes</th>
<th>Pevear and Volokhonsky/ endnotes</th>
<th>Karpelson/ footnotes and comments</th>
<th>Aplin/ endnotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biblical places</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic personalities</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sovietisms and related expressions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References to Russian literary works and personalities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References to foreign literary works (primarily Faust)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblical quotes (rephrased, primarily from Revelation)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblical personalities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gods and divinities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-plays and explanations of typical Russian phrases</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical references</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian cultural-specific terms and concepts (not Sovietisms)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign cultural-specific terms</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of personal names of the characters</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical locations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National traditions, primarily religious</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign words (primarily in German and French)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic events</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and monuments</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanations of inconsistencies and errors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Burgin and O’Connor/ endnotes</th>
<th>Pevear and Volokhonsky/ endnotes</th>
<th>Karpelson/ footnotes and comments</th>
<th>Aplin/ endnotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oblique references to arrest and the secret police</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of solar and lunar themes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive or explanatory notes that interpret the context</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data analysis

Notes provide a window into translators’ perceptions of re-creating the readers themselves and their cultural background. In this final section, I intend to identify the categories of notes used by the various translators to see if there are any similarities or patterns and, most importantly, what these choices entail for future readers. I made several observations by taking Toledano-Buendia’s category of “the requirements of the target text potential reader” (2013, 157) as crucial for this analysis. I also consider that the translator “is always free to choose the degree of cultural informativity offered by the TT at any given point. Although not able to choose the cultural information itself, he or she is free to choose how to impart relevant cultural knowledge to the reader, while still respecting the otherness of the ST” (Sausa, 2002, 23).

All four translations demonstrate similar tendencies in thematic categories. Eight categories were not represented in all translations: (a) explanations of inconsistencies and errors (no comments in Pevear and Volokhonsky’s translation), (b) biblical places (no comments in Karpelson’s translation), (c) gods and divinities (no comments in Burgin and O’Connor’s and in Karpelson’s translations), (d) foreign words (no comments in Karpelson’s translation), (e) explanations of solar and lunar themes (no comments in Pevear and Volokhonsky’s and in Aplin’s translations), (f) historic events (no comments in Pevear and Volokhonsky’s translation), (g) discursive notes (no comments in Aplin’s translation), (h) word-plays (no comments in Karpelson’s and Aplin’s translations), and (i) biblical quotes (no comments in Karpelson’s translation).
There are common thematic fields in which all four translations offer notes or footnotes, and these decisions are significant for the reader. References to Russian and foreign literary works introduce the reader to Bulgakov’s intertextuality, while explanations of the origins of the characters’ personal names give target readers a shortcut to deciphering these names and enabling the translators’ use of foreignized strategies, such as transliteration, without losing important interpretative coordinates. When clarifying Sovietisms and culturally specific terms, notes primarily perform a dictionary-like function. Proffer explains twenty Sovietisms, while Pevear and Volokhonsky’s translation explains sixteens Sovietisms. The subsequent translations by Karpelson and Aplin contain fewer comments in this category, with merely three Sovietisms in Karpelson’s and seven in Aplin’s translations explained. The category of oblique references to arresting and the secret police is closely linked to Sovietisms.

Geographic locations such as “Yershalaim” (the main setting in the Biblical chapters) or “Patriarch’s Ponds” (the setting in the introductory Moscow chapter) help the reader to orient him/herself in both spatial plot planes of the novel, Moscow and Jerusalem, which are occasionally mirrored: “motifs from the Pilate story are repeated in the Moscow narrative, suggesting parallels between space and time” (Proffer, 1995, 101).

Notes on historical personalities and events have an encyclopedic function, and, in this category, the notes significantly differ between translations, depending on the translators’ and Proffer’s subjective personal speculations on readers’ knowledge. Aplin’s translation contains a significantly higher number of comments in this category.

Burgin and O’Connor, and Pevear and Volokhonsky’s, translations contain a higher number of notes in most categories than Karpelson and Aplin’s. Two exceptions are the categories of historical personalities and foreign words, which contain more comments in Aplin’s translation. Burgin and O’Connor, and Pevear and Volokhonsky’s, comments are more extensive and offer more information.

I have previously mentioned fifteen common notes. Otherwise, the choice of names and concepts explained in the notes varies greatly between translations. For instance, Proffer, Karpelson and Aplin explain Woland’s comment that Margarita reminds him of the French Queen, and its historical connotations by providing the footnotes “Queen Margot” (Aplin, 2006, 408), “Margarita” (Burgin and O’Connor 1995, 350) and “one of the French queens who lived in the sixteenth century” (Karpelson 2006, 312), while Pevear and Volokhonsky did not find any explanation necessary. On the other hand, Pevear and Volokhonsky explain that “waltz king” refers to the “Unofficial title of the Viennese composer Johann Strauss (1825–99)” (1997, 407), while Karpelson, Aplin and Proffer do not offer any explanation in this case. Proffer, Pevear and Volokhonsy and Karpelson offer
Explanatory comments on the name Azzazello, a waterless desert demon, one of Woland’s servants, while there is no such comment in Aplin’s translation.

The most thoroughly explained categories in Burgin and O’Connor’s translation are: (a) Sovietisms and related expressions, (b) historical personalities; (c) explanation of personal names of the characters; (d) references to Russian and foreign literary works; (e) discursive notes that interpret or explain the context of the novel and (f) explanations of inconsistencies and errors. Burgin and O’Connor’s translation is the only one in which the notes were prepared by a Bulgakov scholar. This helps clarify the number of discursive comments that not only explain, but also interpret, the context, as the following example demonstrates:

**The threesome** – Woland, the choirmaster, and the care are an unholy trinity, and Ivan is about to have a baptism in the Moscow River (at the very location where the Church of Christ the Redeemer had earlier stood), followed by his version of the Stations of the Cross. There are many details here which are allusions to events of the New Testament – events which are not described in the Pilate chapters, but which are given in parodic form in the Moscow chapters, a pattern which will continue throughout. (1995, 342)

This translation also contains the highest number of explanations of inconsistencies and errors in the narrative:

**Margarita disappears from Moscow** – this may or may not be an error, but it is certainly a mystery – the reader has already read that Margarita died of a heart attack in her apartment. (1995, 359)

The second translation by Pevear and Volokhonsky demonstrates the following choices, which are similar to Burgin and O’Connor’s: (a) historical personalities; (b) Sovietisms and related expressions; (c) biblical quotes; (d) references to Russian and foreign literary works; (e) explanations of personal names of the characters. Their translation is the only one that offers no comments in the following categories: (a) explanations of inconsistencies or errors, (b) historical events, and (c) explanations of solar and lunar themes.

Pevear and Volokhonsky’s translation is the only one that does not offer any notes in the category of inconsistencies or errors but chooses to comment on this category in the introduction. However, “A Note on the Text and Acknowledgements” in the introduction states that they used the text from the original magazine publication, based on Bulgakov’s wife’s typescript, with all cuts restored, as in the Possev and YMCA-Press editions. They also note that Bulgakov left the manuscript in a “slightly unfinished state” and “it contains, for instance, certain inconsistencies – two versions of the “departure” of the Master and Margarita, two
versions of Yeshua’s entry into Yershalaim, two names of Yeshua’s native town” (1997, xix).

Burgin and O’Connor’s and Pevear and Volokhonsky’s translations contain the highest number of explanations of Sovietisms. Considering the historical distance of this epoch and without speculating whether readers are familiar with Solzhenitsyn or other Soviet authors, it is fair to say that readers of translations of The Master and Margarita may not be conversant enough with Soviet history, culture, and social background. In this case, explaining Sovietisms contributes to a better understanding of the original, and the reader benefits more, especially when Bulgakov uses Sovietisms to achieve an ironic effect.

The third translation, by Karpelson, contains the highest number of notes on: (a) historical personalities; (b) Sovietisms and related expressions; (c) references to Russian and foreign literary works; (d) explanations of personal names of the characters; and (e) historical events. Some of these are explained in footnotes, and others in comments. Karpelson is the only translator who did not offer any notes in the following categories: (a) foreign words (though all of them are kept intact in the translation), (b) biblical places, and (c) biblical quotes. The absence of notes in the foreign words category indicates that the translator (or editors) presupposed familiarity with foreign languages on the part of readers. However, aside from this, Karpelson’s translation is domesticated to a greater extent than Burgin and O’Connor or Pevear and Volokhonsky’s.

A few inconsistencies in the text are also explained:

The disappearance of Margarita Nakolayevna and her housekeeper Natasha from Moscow: It is unclear whether this is intentional or an inconsistency that Bulgakov did not have time to fix, since earlier, we are told that the Master and Margarita have died. (2006, 314)

Aplin’s translation includes the highest number of comments in the following categories: (a) historical personalities; (b) Sovietisms and related expressions; (c) references to Russian and foreign literary works; (e) foreign words (primarily in German and French) and (d) historical events. In comparison to the others, Aplin’s translation demonstrates the highest number of notes in two categories: (a) historical personalities and (b) foreign words which were relatively poorly represented in other translations. Aplin’s is the only translation that does not offer any notes in the category “discursive or explanatory notes that interpret or explain context.” Aplin’s comments are short and provide the most essential information.
Conclusion

There is always a dilemma in qualitative studies to draw meaningful conclusions. Simple counting and comparison are not enough. Even though it was impossible here, owing to the number of available examples, to assess every note or thematic field comprehensively, some tendencies do emerge.

The first observation is that the two translations by Burgin and O’Connor and Pevear and Volokhonsky are significantly more heavily annotated (except two categories) than the subsequent translations by Karpelson and Aplin. According to Toledano-, “such decisions are often guided by the expectations of the translation’s addressee as well as by the activities of the publishing company. For instance, some publishing companies may regard footnotes useful to provide additional information about culture specific elements and that it might be appropriate in critical editions of canonical literature” (2013, 156). However, publishing houses do not dictate to translators the content and length of the notes. Taking translators’ assumptions about readers’ cultural knowledge into consideration, the number of notes, especially extensive, detailed, and interpretative ones, illustrate that Proffer and Pevear and Volokhonsky considered the readers’ cultural knowledge less than sufficient and opted to offer them more help and to guide the interpretation of the text. The quantity of interpretative notes in Burgin and O’Connor’s and Pevear and Volokhonsky’s translations also suggests that “the communicative intention of these paratextual messages is not restricted to providing verifiable information as they also express a particular judgement and/or attitude” (Toledano-Buendia, 2013, 159).

Burgin and O’Connor’s translation, the first annotated translation introduced to English readers, was released more than forty years after Glenny’s and Ginsburg’s. This introduced Bulgakov’s narrative to a different contemporary English-speaking audience. Notes can play an important role in enhancing the readers’ understanding of the text and bringing it closer to readers; measures, however, must be taken to ensure the accuracy of the content of the footnotes if they are to be of any benefit. Proffer’s statement that “some of my work here is original but I also owe a great debt to all previous commentators to the Russian editions of the novel” (1995, 337) illustrates that preparing notes to Burgin and O’Connor’s translation required a careful, scholarly, detailed approach. Proffer’s and Pevear and Volokhonsky’s thorough, interpretative comments enable a more successful interaction between the reader and the text, while the fluency of reading is not disturbed by the endnotes.

Proffer’s and Aplin’s decision to offer unnumbered endnotes has certain advantages, as the commentary portion can be read separately, and it is the reader’s choice whether to read it before, after, or during the reading process.
However, endnotes are not necessarily helpful during the reading process, and there is a possibility that some readers will not read them at all. Aplin’s notes are particularly difficult to follow, as they are not divided by chapter. It is unreasonable to expect the reader to check the list of endnotes whenever turning the page.

Karpelson and Aplin opted for a significantly shorter list of concepts that, in their opinion, needed to be explained. The notes in both translations are factual and brief; Karpelson offered only two interpretative notes, and there is not one in Aplin’s translations. The notes’ function for their readers is thus different than in the previous two translations. They do not guide the reader’s interpretation. Still, they offer merely brief, factual information as, according to Toledano-Buendia, “the main characteristic of discursive notes is that the translator does not only ‘say something’, but also comments on something and expresses an opinion about it, that is to say, ‘do something’” (2013, 159). Karpelson and Aplin avoided “doing something” and the purpose of the notes in both translations was not to offer the reader extensive, interpretative information but to briefly introduce the readers to some concepts with which the translators assumed they were unfamiliar.

Translators must always make their own assessment of how sophisticated the target reader is. If a reader of The Master and Margarita does not possess the background cultural knowledge which will allow him/her to identify the text’s allusions, social and historical norms, the level of enjoyment reached is likely to be diminished. Consequently, the target reader may not experience as high a level of satisfaction as the source reader. In such cases, extensive explanatory comments, such as those provided by Proffer and Pevear, and Volokhonsky, who do not take it for granted that the reader will be conversant with all of the cultural and intertextual nuances in the novel, will be helpful to the target reader. This also makes it more likely that the target reader will receive, not necessarily the same, but closer to the level of information as the source text reader.
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Cet article se concentre sur les éléments paratextuels sous forme de notes de fin et de notes de bas de page dans quatre traductions anglaises annotées du roman le plus célèbre de Mikhaïl Boulgakov : Le Maître et Marguerite. L'article vise à analyser la perception des traducteurs de la connaissance culturelle des lecteurs, ce que les traducteurs croient que le public pourrait ne pas savoir et qu’ils considèrent important, et la capacité des traducteurs à reconnaître les allusions et les références de Boulgakov. L'article explore les catégories thématiques et le contenu des notes pour évaluer comment elles permettent aux lecteurs de se familiariser avec un environnement culturel différent et dans quelle mesure les notes sont utiles aux lecteurs. La partie empirique est basée sur l’analyse de plus de cinq cents notes de bas de page et notes de fin divisées en catégories thématiques. L’importance des notes pour comprendre les décisions des traducteurs fondées sur des hypothèses concernant ce qui est potentiellement inconnu du public cible a fait l’objet de nombreuses recherches (Toledano-Buendia 2013; Landers 2001; Sanchez Ortiz 2015; Pellatt 2013). Jusqu’à présent, aucune attention savante n’a été accordée au matériel paratextuel lié aux traductions anglaises de Le Maître et Marguerite de Boulgakov, qui est l’une des œuvres de fiction les plus souvent rettraduites des classiques russes.
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