

Review research paper

**DOG – IMAGE PAREMIAS IN TRANSLATION
(BASED ON NIKITA KHRUSHCHEV’S MEMOIRS)**

Elena V. Carter

Saint Petersburg Mining University, Department of Foreign Languages, Saint Petersburg, Russia

Abstract. *Animalistic metaphors are widely used in political discourse. The paper deals with the comparative analysis of Russian paremias with the constituent element “dog” employed in Nikita Khrushchev’s memoirs and their English translations. The etymology and cultural connotations of the phraseological units are explored as well. The corpus linguistics methodology is used to identify the expressions containing the word “dog.” By applying Conceptual Metaphor Theory and frame semantics, the mappings that serve to recreate the author’s view of “dog” cognition and communication for the reader are investigated. The research contributes to the study of phraseology and translation as it provides an insight into challenges caused by linguistic and cultural differences while transferring metaphorical expressions from one language and culture to another.*

Key words: *dog-image paremia, memoirs, Nikita Khrushchev, translation*

1. INTRODUCTION

At present, the problem of studying universal features, as well as the specificity of national character and mentality, based on the main concept spheres in phraseology is the focus of attention of both Russian and foreign linguists. It is generally accepted that commonalities and dissimilarities of phraseological units in different languages can be identified by means of a frontal interlingual comparison.

The millenary coexistence of men and animals establishes strong links between them based on the life’s experience of endless number of generations and the very individual practice. “The existential reality of animals as biological beings is overtaken by cultural reality in perfect harmony: the animal represents man in a semantic map in their qualities in its virtues and its fault in its dynamics” (Cristea, 2016, 182) which is remarkably imprinted in the storage of paremias about human-like actions and characteristics of animals that are the main sources of metaphors in proverb lore of many languages. Therefore, the analysis of idiomatic expressions with the lexeme “dog,” which is a phraseological forming component, seems interesting in terms of including this core element in paremias that reveal the commonality of associations, as well as their differences in languages compared.

It has been noticed that in Russian paremias, a negative overtone is determined by the use of the word “dog” in relation to a person, while in the English language, “the lexeme is

Submitted January 17th, 2021, accepted for publication March 10th, 2021

Corresponding author: Elena V. Carter. Saint Petersburg Mining University, Department of Foreign Languages, 2, 21st Line, St Petersburg 199106, Russia | E-mail: elena.carter@hotmail.com

not utilized as a swear-word, and it does not carry negative connotations” (Kuzmin, 2004, 138). However, as it appears, from the viewpoint of its emotive evaluation, an English dictionary word “dog” can indeed convey one’s negative attitude describing a man as “a worthless or contemptible person” (*Merriam–Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary*, 2003, 369).

It is important to mention that, in Russian idiomatic expressions, along with the expressive-and-emotive lexeme “собака” [dog], two more words can be used to cover the same notion: “пес” (lit. “male dog”) and “кобель” (lit. “male dog”). While the word “собака” is applied to a “mean, worthless person, wretch” (Macura, 1999c, 2914), the lexeme “пес” refers to a “cur, wretch” (Macura, 1999b, 2040), and the word “кобель” defines a male as a “highly sexed or oversexed man” (Shlyakhov, Adler, 2006, 122).

Another point to be emphasized is that the evaluation bearers in phraseological texts are not only phrases but their text environment as well, motivating the use of expressions, and, from the viewpoint of its emotive evaluation, a context can be either positive or negative depending on the wish and will of the information author (source). With these considerations in mind, the challenges of adequate reproduction of the emotive-and-evaluative content of the information in the process of translating any proverbial metaphors, and the idiomatic expressions with the component “dog,” in particular, seem to be obvious.

2. PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Metaphors are not only capable of showing the similarity of objects and phenomena but create the resemblance representing these entities in a new light. The fact that our conceptual system is not consciously acknowledged means that the resulting behavior is mostly automatic. What follows is that metaphors have the power to shape our perception of the world and can, to some extent, influence our actions.

Metaphor translatability and transfer methods have been extensively studied within the discipline of Translation Studies (Newmark, 1988; Vinogradov, 2001). The cognitive approach (Lacoff, Johnson, 2003) makes it clear that translatability is not only a matter of words but that is also inextricably linked to the conceptual systems of the source and target culture, since one’s conceptualization of reality depends on the language one speaks. Though people have same human experience and observations, imagery wells from different conditions and habitat.

Animals have been frequently present in mythology, religious conceptions, teachings, philosophy, superstitions and customs, the lunar calendar and the allied zodiac. They have participated in the creation of language culture and can be found in art, literature as well as in the treasury of proverbial folk wisdom. Historically, all idioms and phrasemes have been coined to reflect a recurrent and generally shared experience drawing on those words and things that were in the center of such practice and observations. Though specific within the longer framework of phraseology, this holds for paremias, too.

There are a number of reasons to trace animal images of proverb lore. One of them is the possibility to focus on a plentiful source of metaphors in proverbial texts. “The other reason to study animal gallery of proverbs is the observation that there are both local and world-wide features in animal imagery used in proverbs” (Lauhakangas, 2019, 583).

It is impossible to list thousands of proverbial sayings and observations about dogs being widely different in different languages having been coined anonymously or by some famous people letting us know their preference and attitude to this animal. The

“people are dogs” metaphor is an interesting case because, undoubtedly, the conceptualization of a man as a dog differs according to geographical circumstances and cultural values. While in the European tradition, the dog, the first animal domesticated by man and his faithful follower to death, is cared, and it “takes on various human traits, austerity of life, the respect and love of neighbor, its value and recognition, their devotion and tenderness for human companion” (Cristea, 2016, 183), in parts of Asia, the dog is bred and killed for its meat (Chase, 2002), thus being considered food for nourishment. As for the Muslim tradition, the dog is sometimes considered impure and, therefore, “a source of moral danger” (El Fadle, 2008, 448). In some cultures, the term “dog” may carry both positive and negative connotations, thus being classified as an ambivalent symbol. For instance, in China, the dog played and still plays an important and chiefly a positive role in the popular spiritual culture of several nationalities. However, due to its lower position on the traditional animal value scale, the motif of the dog is presumably the most suitable among the main domestic animals’ motifs “for the purpose of pillorying the mistakes, faults, and shortcomings of man” (Hatalová, 2007, 183).

It is a common claim that translating by target language equivalents is the most productive way of making the rendering of paremiias figurative. The presence of figurativeness in translation of proverbial sayings helps to communicate the necessary emotive evaluation. When using this method, translators have to observe that an equivalent is properly selected, viz. the chosen equivalent should be able to convey such target language idiom’s indices for interpretation as meaning, usage, overtones, and style. Certainly, “all paremiias without exception are situational in the sense that they are not only used in a certain situation, but are models or signs of that situation” (Permyakov, 1979, 136). The meaning of the proverb is very much dependent on the contexts in which it is used, and, hence, it should be analyzed in accordance with it. Similar paremiias, irrespective of their language material, are concrete image variants of typical situations, the latter playing the role of invariants with respect to concrete proverbs. It is assumed that translation difficulties usually arise in the cases when there happens to be no corresponding idiom in the target language that can be used for rendition, or when the existing equivalent cannot be employed as it is because, for any reason, its contextual usage may be dubious. As it turns out, this issue is even more complicated in relation to the translation of paremiias with the basic component “dog.”

Paremiias contain plenty of truth, wisdom, and knowledge which they express in a few colorful words. The message of the proverbial expression is communicated quickly and to the point, making it a very useful tool in political discourse. In his uplifting books, internationally acknowledged paremiologist Wolfgang Mieder provided much evidence that quite a number of well-known erudite American public figures were masterful employers of proverbs and, particularly, zoomorphic metaphors in their political speeches and in their writings (Mieder, 2000; Mieder, 2001). Some Soviet/Russian leaders (for instance, Vladimir Lenin, Joseph Stalin, and Mikhail Gorbachev) revealed their inclination for the use of paremiias as well (McKenna, 2000; Meščerskij, 1981). There is no doubt that the application of proverbs added significantly to the communicative and emotional quality of such rhetoric to millions of people. As presidents and political figures struggled to find the right words to relate to people of different cultural, ethnic and intellectual backgrounds, they did well in citing of numerous animalistic paremiias as sapient nuggets of human wisdom.

Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev (1894 – 1971), a Russian politician, led the Soviet Union during the period of the Cold War. He served as the First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and as Chairman of the Council of Ministers. Khrushchev was responsible

for the de-Stalinization of the country, for backing the progress of the early Soviet space program, and for several relatively liberal reforms in areas of domestic policy “during the Thaw” (Podolskiy, Voloshinova, 2019, 700). Ousted from power in 1964, Khrushchev became a pensioner living on the outskirts of Moscow. To keep himself going but also to make sure that his side of the story survived, Khrushchev dictated hundreds of hours of reminiscences. Many of the tapes were smuggled to the West, and in 1970, his first translated “herculean effort that became the centerpiece of his last years” (Taubman, 2003, 631) was published in America. After the collapse of the USSR, the politician’s memoirs were finally published in Russia as well.

While Nikita Khrushchev’s predilection for the proverbial rhetoric has been noticed and paid some attention to (Burlatsky, 2008; Dautova, 2011), there are relatively few studies that exemplify his contextual employment of ready-made bits of popular verbal genre (Carter, 2016; Carter, 2019), and there does not seem to be any research specifically focused on the use and the translation of the “dog-image” paremias. Thus, the present study is aimed at filling this gap.

The article provides the contrastive analysis of Russian paremias with the constituent element “dog” utilized in Nikita Khrushchev’s celebrated recollections with their English translations. The etymology and cultural connotations of the idiomatic expressions are scrutinized as well. Special attention is paid to the discussion of commonalities and differences of the analyzed metaphors in the languages in question.

The comparative analysis of the contextual examples of rendering the Russian zoomorphic phraseological units into English shows that the main methods of their interpretation are the literal translation with the following commentaries and the translation by way of equivalents or analogues lacking in animalistic imagery. Of special interest are the cases when the “dog” component unexpectedly “appears” in the English version, or the adequacy of transferring the negative emotive overtone in certain contexts seems to be disputable.

3. CORPUS AND METHODOLOGY

In the present research, paremias with the *dog* component were examined in the parallel corpus, i.e. “a corpus that contains source texts and their translations” (McEnery, Xiao, 2007, 20), which includes the Russian memoir manuscript of Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev (Khrushchev, 2016a; Khrushchev, 2016b), along with their translations in the English language (*Khrushchev Remembers*, 1970; *Khrushchev Remembers*, 1974; *Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev*, 2004; *Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev*, 2006; *Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev*, 2007). According to McEnery and Xiao (2007, 18), “such corpora can give new insights into the languages compared – insights that are not likely to be noticed in studies of monolingual corpora;” they can be used for a range of comparative purposes and can increase our knowledge of language-specific, typological and cultural differences, as well as universal features. They can be used for a number of practical applications, for instance, in language teaching and translation (Sishchuk, Gerasimova, Goncharova, 2019).

After compiling a parallel corpus, the original texts and their translations were searched for the target phraseological units with the constituent element “dog.” Then the subcorpus of text fragments with the phraseological forming component was compiled, and each example was analyzed in terms of conceptual metaphors as well as their possible linguistic equivalents/analogues, thus identifying the commonalities and distinctive features.

4. ANALYSIS

4.1. Traditional proverbial expression “Вешать всех собак”

It is commonly assumed that paremiias activate culturally established and accepted mental schemata. The origin of the Slavic phraseological unit “вешать всех собак” (lit. “to hung all dogs”) is associated with one of the senses of the word “собака” [dog] that is a burdock, “a plant whose prickly, tenacious cones can easily cling to a person” (Dal, 2014, 92). It was believed that “a burdock hung on the clothes of enemies was a spell to bring them trouble” (Mokienko, 2018, 236). In Russian, this phrase means to unfairly charge anyone for everything. As can be seen from the examples given below, the Russian proverbial text “вешать всех собак” is unquestionably pertinent to the cases dealt with the unjust treatment of people or countries. This expression is thought not to be difficult for Russian native speakers to process and, though it involves a metaphor, it is not in need of any further explanation. However, the suggested literal translation in the first situation (“all dogs were being hung”) might raise a question about the relevant mental schema of the metaphor being activated in the minds of the readers of the English-speaking world. But it is highly probable that the receptors could adequately decipher the emotive-and-evaluative content of the Russian transferred metaphor and comprehend it because of the commentary given in the parentheses. As for the other cases, this challenging proverbial text was rendered by way of the analogues lacking in animalistic imagery but certainly covering the meaning:

All the dogs were being hung on Malinovsky at that time [that is everything that went wrong was being pinned on him]. (Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev, 2004, 471)

Evidence was piling up against Malinovsky. (Khrushchev Remembers, 1970, 204)

На Малиновского вешали тогда всех собак. (Khrushchev, 2016a, 346)

All the blame was pinned on me for this action at that time. (Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev, 2007, 570)

На меня и тогда вешали всех собак за эту акцию. (Khrushchev, 2016b, 156)

After all, I remember how the Poles had denounced us in 1956 when the Soviet Union was blamed for everything. (Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev, 2007, 634)

Ведь помнил, как поляки поносили нас в 1956 году, когда всех собак вешали на Советский Союз. (Khrushchev, 2016b, 211)

Kir had many kind things to say about me, as it was pleasant to hear them at that tense moment when all the blame was being placed on our policies and the capitalist press was trying to isolate us. (Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev, 2007, 252)

Кир высказал много любезностей в мой адрес, и мне было приятно это услышать в напряженный момент, когда на нашу политику вешали всех собак, и буржуазная пресса хотела нас изолировать. (Khrushchev, 2016b, 593)

4.2. Variation of the universal paremia “Вот где собака зарыта!”

Paremiias are not but metaphors, and, for this reason, person always shows his/her creative capacity to transmit any images and reveal to others what does not exist or remains hidden. The proverb “Вот где собака зарыта!” (lit. “this is where the dog is buried”) is identified as having general currency in many languages: for instance, “in French (C’est là que le bât blesse), in Spanish (A burro muerto, la cebada al rabo), in Italian (Qui casca l’asino), etc.” (Puchcho, 2012, 36). This paremia is definitely in need of historical and cultural explanation. With respect to the origin of this Russian adage,

there are different views. As asserted by Mokienko (2018, 236), the Russian proverb “Вот где собака зарыта!” is a literal translation from the German phraseological unit “Hier liegt der Hund begraben.” In German, the image of the black dog was associated with the evil spirit guarding the buried treasure. Later, the word “dog” began to be used to denote the treasure itself. An alternative view is that the dog was often the subject of sacrifices, especially during the construction of temples. When some of its pieces had been eaten by priests (who considered to join the divine mind in such a way), “the rest of the animal was buried near the moat” (Makovsky, 1999, 104). As for the paremia, it simply emphasizes that something is the root of the matter”, i.e. “what’s where the trouble lies” (Macura, 199b, 2914). This is exactly the way the Soviet Premier employed this metaphorical saying in the cases below, but the English renditions of one and the same proverbial saying were not identical in different editions (the literal translation with the following explanation and the analogue lacking in zoomorphic imagery):

I felt that, most likely, this was “where the dog was buried,” the source of the problem. (Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev, 2004, 213)

On the basis of what I was told, I sensed that I had found the weak spot. (Khrushchev Remembers, 1970, 122)

Я почувствовал, что именно тут зарыта собака. (Khrushchev, 2016a, 172)

4.3. Proverbial saying “Собака, кусающая руку, кормящую ее хлебом”

The proverbial expression “Собака, кусающая руку, кормящую ее хлебом” [A dog biting the hand that feeds it] concerns the relationship between people and animals and has a metaphorical meaning. The phrase categorizes a dog’s and a dishonorable man’s behavior to be the same. Thus, the user of the saying accuses the other one of violating the moral order of the community. Despite many differences between the two languages compared, the highest correspondence of the Russian and the English proverbial metaphors in terms of meaning, structure and function can be observed:

After his speech the Spanish Communist Comrade Dolores Ibarruri took the floor and responded to Hoxha with indignation. She compared him to a dog biting the hand that feeds it. (Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev, 2007, 502)

I remember Dolores Ibarruri’s impassioned speech in which she likened Enver Hoxha to a dog which bites the hand that feeds it. (Khrushchev Remembers, 1974, 268)

После его выступления говорила товарищ Ибаррури, с возмущением отозвавшаяся о Ходже. Она его сравнивала с собакой, кусающей руку, кормящую ее хлебом. (Khrushchev, 2016b, 102)

4.4. Modification of the proverbial comparison “Выть как стая бешенных собак”

When one needs to describe anybody’s behavior not being accepted by the community, animals give stereotypic models for that. “In the Old Testament, the conceptualization of the servant as a dog emphasizes his low status and unimportance” (Waśniewska, 2018, 13). Albeit, it should be noted that at the time, when the Scripture was written, in Israel, dogs were mostly undomesticated and lived in large packs, posing an actual threat to humans. This suggests that, on the one hand, the meaning of the metaphor might have changed in a course of time, as did the attitudes toward the canine; on the other hand, the fear of dogs as aggressive animals who live and hunt in packs could be traced to present day proverbial expressions. One more recent instance of the usage of the “people are dogs” metaphor

includes the negative portrayal of the bourgeois print media compared to a howling pack of rabid hounds in the translation of Khrushchev’s memoirs published in 1974. It is particularly noteworthy that, in the original, it is not specified which of the canids (i.e. wolves, jackals, foxes, coyotes, or dogs) were making similar sounds in the “proverbial comparison on animal identity” (Krikmann, 2001, 21). Clearly, it comes as no surprise that this expanded English rendition of the Russian metaphor vividly entails the conceptualization of the “enemy” press as a pack of vicious and cruel animals:

Then, we exploded our atomic bomb, the capitalist press emitted a heartrending wail. They said the Russians had gotten this bomb from Kapitsa, that he was a no-good so-good so-and-so, that he was the most prominent scientist living in our country, and that only he could have produced the bomb. (Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev, 2006, 498)

After we exploded our first atomic bomb, the bourgeois press started howling like a pack of mad dogs about how the Russians must have gotten their A-bomb from Kapitsa because he was the only physicist capable of developing the bomb. (Khrushchev Remembers, 1974, 64)

А когда мы взорвали свою первую атомную бомбу, поднялся истошный вой в буржуазной прессе: эту бомбу русские получили из рук Капицы, вот он такой-сякой, крупнейший ученый, живущий там, только он и мог создать ее. (Khrushchev, 2016a, 871)

4.5. Proverbial expression “Собачья преданность”

It is widely recognized that through animals, man taught, clarified, revealed truths, being similar to animals. It has been noticed that “the faithfulness or devotion of the dog to his master is used as a metaphor for an ordinary man’s devotion and loyalty to his master” (Hatalová, 2007, 167). The following, however, is an example of the “opposite” metaphorization when a positive feature of a dog serves as a metaphor of a negative characteristic of the delegate staff of the labor union representation in the workforce. It looks like the translators have managed to find the way to render the Russian phraseological text by the English full equivalent conveying the same type of overtones as the context of the original does:

The trade unions didn’t want to dirty their clothing by contract with representatives of the Soviet government, and they wanted to make a display of their doglike loyalty to capitalism and their hostility toward socialism. (Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev, 2007, 123)

Once again, I found myself faced with hostility on the part of American union leaders, who didn’t want to stain their clothes by coming into contact with the representatives of the Soviet Union. They were demonstrating their doglike loyalty to capitalism and their unfriendliness toward socialism. (Khrushchev Remembers, 1974, 401)

Профсоюзы не хотели запятнать свои профсоюзные одежды контактом с представителями советского государства, демонстрировали свою собачью преданность капитализму и враждебность к социализму. (Khrushchev, 2016b, 494)

4.6. Proverbial text “Верный пес”

We have some additional examples to illustrate the “opposite” metaphorization discussed above. It should be stressed that an animal in a proverb does not always point out the entire man but common attitudes, strong feelings, any thoughts or traits of

character. According to Čermák (2014, 188), “the most common similes based on *dog* (*pes*) are those expressing loyalty.” As can be seen in the instance below, although a dog figures as an epitome of loyalty, it surely conveys negative overtones while referring to the politicians of the capitalist countries. The translators of Khrushchev’s memoirs used different ways of rendering this metaphor into English (a full equivalent and an analogue with the preserved animal image) to ensure the author’s definite evaluation of certain public figures and to eliminate all possible doubts of the reader in this respect:

*I am not even talking about Iraq, where an extremely reactionary government was performing its functions during those same months [of 1957]. It was headed by a man who had been installed by the British imperialist, Nuri Said, a man of **doglike loyalty** to his colonialist masters. (Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev, 2007, 870)*

*Iraq had the most reactionary government of all the Arab states. The government was headed by Nuri Said, a puppet of British imperialism and **a faithful dog** of the colonialists. (Khrushchev Remembers, 1974, 340)*

*Я не говорю здесь об Ираке, где функционировало в те месяцы весьма реакционное правительство, возглавлявшееся ставленником британского империализма и **верным псом** колонизаторов Нури Саудом. (Khrushchev, 2016b, 384)*

*Even though I sometimes called Dulles a chained cur of imperialism or **a faithful dog** of capitalism, I knew the day would come when we would find a good word to say for him. (Khrushchev Remembers, 1974, 363)*

4.7. Standard proverbial comparison “Как цепной пес”

As mentioned above, animal metaphors suit well to characterize public figures belonging to different political camps. The Russian simile “как цепной пес” (lit. “as a chained male dog”) in negative contexts certainly produces negative evaluation. As admitted by Hatalová (2007, 167), “a frequent source of metaphor or even of a symbol of man’s incorrect or wrong action is the ‘aggressive’ behavior – barking or biting of the dog, in fact, only its necessary defense.” So, we can observe an objective metaphorization, viz. a metaphorization in accordance with the empirical experience gained from the relationship with the animal or from the observation of the animal when a negative quality (being belligerent in this case) is metaphorized as a negative one in the same manner it is figuratively applied to man. Though it looks like the translators of the memoirs could find the English analogues to the Russian idiom to agree to the necessary overtones, the comparison of someone with a watchdog seems not to be quite the same as the comparison with an attack dog due to the difference of the animal’s “duties”:

*But blocking the path toward a relaxation of tensions was John Foster Dulles. He was **like a watchdog**, the way he sat down right next to Eisenhower and directed his every action. (Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev, 2007, 41)*

*But that **vicious cur** Dulles was always prowling around Eisenhower, snapping at him, if he got out of line. (Khrushchev Remembers, 1970, 398)*

*Но на пути к смячению напряженности находился Даллес. Он, **как цепной пес**, восседал возле Эйзенхауэра, направляя его действия. (Khrushchev, 2016b, 437)*

*I was sure that Eisenhower understood everything, but he could not acknowledge that we were right, and Dillon was turned loose **as a kind of attack dog**. (Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev, 2007, 162)*

*Я уверен, что Эйзенхауэр все понимал, но не мог признать нашу правоту, и Диллон был выпущен в качестве **цепного пса**. (Khrushchev, 2016b, 524)*

4.8. Common Russian paremia “Черного кобеля не отмоешь добела”

The identity of a man, namely, what makes a certain kind of man a certain kind of man, and distinguishes him/her from other people, the impossibility or possibility to change his/her identity is the metaphorical meaning represented by groups of paremiias in literal meaning statements about the identity of the dog, or of the impossibility, or possibility to change the whole identity or appearance, qualities. “Most paremiias within these groups were created only, or particularly for the reason of figurative expression, they originally had no real motivation derived from empirical experience” (Hatalová, 2007, 172). It seems that the Russian proverb “Черного кобеля не отмоешь добела” is one of such paremiias.

Interpreters are to take into consideration undesirable connotations based on swear-words and try to avoid employing them. According to Kuzmin (1977, 91), “translators should never use the adjective ‘black’ with the meaning of ‘bad’ in relation to a human being – directly or indirectly,” because it may cause insulting in English. There have been many attempts to render the Russian proverb “Черного кобеля не отмоешь добела” (lit. “A black male dog cannot be washed white”), concerning the animal identity when an animal retains the somatic features of its species (for example, fur or color) that “cannot be eliminated – changed” (Krikmann, 2001, 20).

Comparing the meaning, usage, and overtones of the Russian adage under discussion with those of the English translations, the point should be made that, though there is no linguistically discernible motivation of the Russian and English proverbs by the “кобель” (“he-dog”) and “кот” (“he-cat”) component, the suggested interpretations may impose the undesirable connotation on the English-speaking reader. The Biblical proverb “The leopard cannot change its spots” (Macura, 1999a, 1093)/ “You can’t make a leopard change its spots” (Kuzmin, 2004, 144) might be the most applicable analogue in this case.

We tried to whitewash Stalin, to clean him up. We acted contrary to the Russian proverb that says: “You can’t keep washing a black cat till it turns white.” There’s no doubt that he was a black cat, but still we were trying to wash him white. (Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev, 2006, 212)

Мы старались обелить Сталина, отмыть, действовали вразрез с русской поговоркой, что черного кобеля не отмоешь добела. Нет сомнения, что это был черный кобель, а мы его все-таки хотели отмыть. (Khrushchev, 2016a, 646)

During the Twentieth Congress everyone found out that Stalin had abused power, but we still trembled before the authority that Stalin had held in the past, so much so that we were unable to condemn his atrocities at the top of our voices. In this we were going against the Russian proverb that says, “You can’t keep washing a black cat until it turns white.” (Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev, 2007, 688)

В ходе XX съезда все узнали, что Сталин злоупотреблял властью. Но мы еще так трепетали перед его былым авторитетом, что в полный голос не могли осудить его зверства, действуя вразрез русской поговорке, что черного кобеля не отмоешь добела. (Khrushchev, 2016b, 251)

5. CONCLUSION

In view of the findings, it is clear that one of the themes in Nikita Khrushchev's metaphorical usage in memoirs is the likening of people to dogs. They are compared to hounds in many respects. The analyzed contextual illustrations of *dog*-image paremias are mostly the demonstrations of an objective metaphorization of the dog motif and, in some cases, an opposite one; the main parallels between a dog and a man occur in the abilities to guard and secure. As it appears, for the most part, the metaphorical use of the *dog*-image paremias in the Russian leader's writings is directly related to different policy-makers. The attention of the target audience is particularly focused on their behavior and actions which reveal the author's negative attitude. The repertoire of the animalistic idiomatic expressions by the Soviet politician definitely adds some expressiveness and colloquial color to his recollections occupied with his reflections on different historical and political events.

The English renditions of the Russian contextualized examples demonstrate various means of their realization in the target language: translating by equivalents or analogues. It has been found out that in order to make the English proverbial texts adequate, in the cases, when the target phraseological unit does not convey the meaning of the Russian idiom, the literal translation with the following commentaries and the translation by way of analogues lacking in zoomorphic imagery have been applied.

The discussed cases clearly show the challenges arising in connection with the translation of the "dog" metaphors from the original into the English language due to the obstacles, cultural and linguistic. Though some English analogues, deriving from the same source and coinciding literally, are used in the same figurative sense as their Russian counterparts are, thus not causing much trouble, others are challenging for translation into English. Therefore, translators should be aware of it and exercise great care in using the English metaphorical "dog" while rendering the Russian proverbial text with the same constituent element as it is evident that the emotive-and-evaluating content of the information must not be ignored and should be transferred into the target language as well to make the translation sound proverbial. Considering the fact that the paremias with the basic component "dog" reveal not only commonalities but also dissimilarities based on culture-related specific features, this area certainly demands further attention.

REFERENCES

- Burlatsky, F.M. 2008. *Khrushchev i jego sovetniki – krasnyje, chjornyje, belyje* [Khrushchev and His Advisers – Red, Black, White]. Moskva: Sobranije.
- Carter, E. 2016. "God Knows": Nikita Khrushchev's Use of Biblical Proverbs in America. In: R.J.B. Soares and Q. Lauhakangas (eds.). *Proceedings of the 9th Interdisciplinary Colloquium on Proverbs, 1st to 8th November 2015, at Tavira, Portugal*. Pp. 145–156. Tavira: Tipografia Tavirensa.
- Carter, E. 2019. "Sword" Metaphors in Nikita Khrushchev's Political Rhetoric. In: G.C. Pastor and R. Mitkov (eds.). *Computational and Corpus-Based Phraseology. Third International Conference, Europhras. Malaga, Spain, September 25–27, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence 11755*. Pp. 73–85. Switzerland: Springer.

- Čermák, F. 2014. Dog and Cat Proverbs: A Comparison of English, Czech, Finnish and Other Languages. In: F. Čermák. *Proverbs: Their Lexical and Semantic Features*. Pp. 183–195. Burlington, Vermont: The University of Vermont.
- Chase, A. 2002. Strange Foods. *Castronomica*, 2 (2): 94–96.
- Cristea, S.D. 2016. Animals in Proverbs. In: R.J.B. Soares and Q. Lauhakangas (eds.). *Proceedings of the 9th Interdisciplinary Colloquium on Proverbs, 1st to 8th November 2015, at Tavira, Portugal*. Pp. 180–188. Tavira: Tipografia Tavirensa.
- Dal, V.I. 2014. *Tolkovy slovar zhivogo velikorusskogo yazyka* [Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language]. Moskva: Slavyansky Dom Knigi.
- Dautova, R.V. 2011. N. S. Khrushchev i zarubezhnaya zhurnalistika [N.S. Khrushchev and Foreign Journalism]. *Vestnik Udmurskogo Universiteta. Istorija i filologija*, 1: 116–123.
- El Fadl, K.A. 2008. Dogs in the Islamic Tradition. In: B. Taylor (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Religion and Nature*. Pp. 498–500. New York: Continuum International.
- Hatalová, H. 2007. The Dog as a Metaphor or Symbol in Chinese Popular Phraseology. *Asian and African Studies*, 16 (2): 161–185.
- Khrushchev Remembers*. 1970. Boston: Little Brown.
- Khrushchev Remembers: The Last Testament*. 1974. Boston: Little Brown.
- Khrushchev, N.S. 2016a. *Vospominaniya. Vremya. Lyudi. Vlast* [Reminiscences. Time. People. Power]. V 2 kn. Kn. 1. Moskva: Veche.
- Khrushchev, N.S. 2016b. *Vospominaniya. Vremya. Lyudi. Vlast* [Reminiscences. Time. People. Power]. V 2 kn. Kn. 2. Moskva: Veche.
- Krikmann, A. 2001. Proverbs on Animal Identity: Typological Memoirs. *Folklore. Electronic Journal of Folklore*, 17: 7–84, <https://haldjas.folklore.eelfolklore>
- Kuzmin, S.S. 1977. *Perevod russkikh frazeologizmov na angliiskiy yazyk* [Translation of Russian Phraseologisms into the English Language]. Moskva: Vysshaya shkola.
- Kuzmin, S.S. 2004. *Idiomatichesky perevod s russkogo yazyka na angliiskiy (Teoriya i praktika)* [Idiomatic Translation from Russian into English (Theory and Practice)]. Moskva: Flinta.
- Lacoff, G. and Johnson, M. 2003. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lauhakangas, O. 2019. The Functions of Animal Metaphors in Proverbs. In: R.J.B. Soares and Q. Lauhakangas (eds.). *Proceedings of the 12th Interdisciplinary Colloquium on Proverbs, 4th to 11th November 2018, at Tavira, Portugal*. Pp. 582–594. Tavira: Tipografia Tavirensa.
- Makovsky, M.M. 1999. *Istoriko-etimologicheskyy slovar angliiskogo yazyka* [Historical and Etymological Dictionary of the English Language]. Moskva: Izdatelsky Dom “Dialog.”
- Macura, P. 1999a. *Elsevier’s Russian–English Dictionary*. 2nd Revisited Edition. Part 2. New York: ELSEVIER.
- Macura, P. 1999b. *Elsevier’s Russian–English Dictionary*. 2nd Revisited Edition. Part 3. New York: ELSEVIER.
- Macura, P. 1999c. *Elsevier’s Russian–English Dictionary*. 2nd Revisited Edition. Part 4. New York: ELSEVIER.
- McEnery, A. and Xiao, R. 2007. Parallel and Comparable Corpora: What is Happening? In: M. Rogers and G. Anderman (eds.). *Incorporating Corpora: The Linguist and the Translator*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- McKenna, K.J. 2000. Propaganda and Proverbs: “Big Fish Eat Little Fish” in Pravda Political Cartoons. In: W. Mieder (ed.). *Proverbium: Yearbook of International Proverb Scholarship*. Pp. 217–242. Burlington, Vermont: The University of Vermont.
- Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev*. 2004. Volume 1. Commissar. [1918–1945]. Providence, Rhode Island: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev*. 2006. Volume 2. Reformer. [1945–1954]. Providence, Rhode Island: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev*. 2007. Volume 3. Statesman. [1953–1964]. Providence, Rhode Island: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Merriam–Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary*. 2003. 11th Edition. Springfield, Massachusetts: Merriam–Webster Incorporated.
- Meščerskij, N.A. 1981. Traditionell–buchsprachliche Ausdrücke in der heutigen russischen Literatursprache (anhand der Werke V.I.Lenins). In: H. Jaksche, A. Siam and H. Burger (eds.). *Reader zur sowjetischen Phraseologie*. Pp. 131–143. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Mieder, W. 2000. *The Proverbial Abraham Lincoln: An Index to Proverbs in the Works of Abraham Lincoln*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Mieder, W. 2001. “No Struggle, No Progress”: *Frederick Douglass and His Proverbial Rhetoric for Civil Rights*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Mokienko, V.M. 2018. *Pravilno li my govorim po-russky? Pogovorki: chto my o nikh znayem, otкуда oni prishli, kak ikh pravilno ponimat i upotrebyat* [Do We Speak Russian Correctly? Proverbial Expressions: What We Know about Them, Where They Came from, How to Understand and Use Them Correctly]. Moskva: Tsentrpoligraf.
- Newmark, P. 1988. *A Text Book of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Permyakov, G.L. 1979. *From Proverb to Folk-Tale: Notes on the General Theory of Cliché*. Moskva: “Nauka” Publishing House.
- Podolskiy, S.I. and Voloshinova, I.V. 2019. “Dlya polzy goroda ya gotov poklonitsya khot chyortu”: glava Lensoveta N.I. Smirnov v period ottepele (1954 – 1962) [For the Good of the City, I’m Ready to Bow to the Devil”: The Head of the Leningrad City Council N.I. Smirnov during the Thaw (1954 – 1962)]. *Noveishaya istoriya Rossii*, 9 (3): 697–711.
- Puchcho, D. 2012. *Mnogoyazychny slovar sovremennoy frazeologii* [Multilingual Dictionary of Modern Phraseology]. Moskva: Flinta.
- Shlyakhov, V. and Adler, E. 2006. *Dictionary of Russian Slang and Colloquial Expressions*. New York: Barron’s.
- Sishchuk, J.M., Gerasimova, I.G. and Goncharova, M.V. 2019. Anthropocentric world picture in German and English geological and mining metaphoric terms. In: *Innovation-Based Development of the Mineral Resources Sector: Challenges and Prospects – 11th Conference of the Russian-German Raw Materials*. Pp. 555–560. London: CRC PRESS/Balkema.
- Taubman, W. 2003. *Khrushchev: The Man and His Era*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Vinogradov, V.S. 2001. *Vvedeniye v perevodovedeniye* [Introduction to Translation]. Moskva: Izdatelstvo “Institut obshchego srednego obrazovaniya.”
- Waśniewska, M. 2018. A Dog or a Wolf – The Role of Connotations in Animalistic Metaphors and the Process of Dehumanization. *New Horizons in English Studies. Language & Didactics*, 3: 3–17.