насамперед прагнути до еквівалентності перекладу, а далі, виходячи з принципу адекватності, тобто смислового добору сегментів вихідної мови, прагнути до творчого та креативного пошуку вдалих прийомів і способів їх перекладу [9].

Література

1. Сітко А.В. Проблема відтворення граматичної семантики інтерогативів засобами цільової мови. *Проблеми семантики, прагматики та когнітивної лінгвістики*. К.: Логос, 2012. Вип. 22. С. 267-274. **2**. Матасов Р.А. Перевод кино- и видеоматериалов: лигвокультурологические и дидактические аспекты: дис. на соискание учен. степени канд. филол. наук: Московский гос. ун-т им. М. В. Ломоносова. М., 2009. 211 с. **3**. Бідасюк Н.В., Боднар Р.В.: Практикум перекладу. Англійська – українська. Київ: Знання, 2011. С. 317-372. **4**. Скоромыслова Н.В. Теоретический аспект перевода художественных фильмов. *Вестник МГОУ*. Серия «Лингвистика». 2010. С. 153-156. **5**. Кулікова А.Є. Мова і культура. *Дублювання як один з основних видів аудіовізуального перекладу: недоліки та переваги*: матеріали міжнар. науч.-практ. конф. м. Одеса, 2010 р. С. 7. **6**. Игнатьева И.Г. Перевод медиатекстов: особенности вербальных репрезентаций событийной компоненты фоновых знаний. *Вестник Московского ун-та. Серия 19: Лингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация*. 2009. № 4. С. 149-156. **7**. Сітко А.В. Роль контексту під час перекладу інтерогативних висловлювань. *Мовні і концептуальні картини світу*. К.: Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, 2009. Вип. 26 (3). С. 143-148. **8**. Кулікова А. Особливості, переваги та недоліки закадрового перекладу аудіовізуальної продукції: *Матеріали IX Міжвузівської конференції молодих учених*. Донецьк, 2011. С. 85-94 с. **9**. Сітко А.В., Струк І.В. Адекватність і еквівалентність у перекладі мовних особливостей. *Sciences of Europe*, Praha, 2016. Vol 1 (10). С. 122-126.

Olga Romanova, Deniss Gamezo
Riga, Latvia

Depiction of Characters' Social Background through their Sociolect in Charles Dickens' Novel *Hard Times* and its Russian Translation: Politeness Formulae

The present research is devoted to the study of politeness formulae conveying the characters' social background and origin in Charles Dickens' novel "Hard Times" and in its Russian translation. The goal of the research is to determine the features that characterise the upper-class, middle-class, and lower-class sociolects in the original novel and to compare them to the features found in the translation.

Keywords: social stratification, sociolect, politeness formulae, Victorian England, Charles Dickens, Russian translation

Class distinction is a phenomenon observed in most societies that have existed throughout history. It can be seen particularly clearly in the period of industrialisation and urbanisation that took place in the English society in the early days of the Victorian era. Class discrimination became a particularly pressing social issue at that time. Charles Dickens was one of the prominent literary authors of the era, who was concerned with the problem of classism and examined the characteristics of different social classes as well as their relationships and interactions.

One of the ways of signifying the belonging of a literary character to a particular social class is through their language use. The character's speech reflects the sociolect that exists in a particular country at the time of the creation of the novel. Various features contribute to the peculiarity of a sociolect attributed to a certain class. One of the main challenges of translating such literary works lies in the cross-linguistic transfer of various sociolects and other specific features of speech. These peculiarities arise due to the historical development of the language, history and structure of the society in which it is spoken. Owing to these factors, the languages of social classes contain different features in different societies. Thus, it is crucial for linguists and anthropologists alike to understand the capacities and the limits of translation of discourse belonging to various sociolects.

The present research scrutinises Charles Dickens' novel *Hard Times – For These Times* (1854) and its translation into Russian by Vera Toper (*Вера Топер* 1960). By the time the novel was published, the main social classes in England had already emerged after the Industrial Revolution, and Charles Dickens had had enough time to observe them and enough literary and journalistic experience to document the style of their speech accurately. Another reason for choosing this novel is that the three main social classes (Working (Lower), Middle, and Upper) are represented there with ample amount of speech and descriptions. The goal of the research is to determine by what linguistic means Dickens portrays his characters' class and compare them to how they are transferred to the Russian translation.

It has been hypothesised that due to the importance of characters' origin in Dickens' oeuvre, class distinction should be preserved wherever possible in the Russian translation of the novel, although the means of expressing sociolect are different as due to differences in social structure and literary norms in both cultures. Thus, social class may be less pronounced in the characters' discourse in the Russian translation.

In a study of a particular culture, it is customary to describe its structure using the terms specific to that society. The underlying reason for social inequality is the heterogeneity of the individuals which manifests itself in unequal distribution of resources [1, p. 57]. The form of social stratification

that is of interest to the modern sociology and anthropology developed gradually over many centuries and reached its present form in the European society of the 18th century following the period of rapid industrialisation and urbanisation.

The basic form of social stratification of the Victorian time is the dual distinction between two strata: the lower class and the upper class [2, p. 58]. According to Marxist theory, only two classes exist: the bourgeoisie or the owners of the means of production and the proletariat or the workers [3, p. 870]. This is the first theoretical social hierarchy to be based on the socio-economic class as the main factor. Although Marxist ideas are often seen as obsolete in modern mainstream sociology, they were the dominant approach of describing the European social structure in the past two centuries. Max Weber's theory of stratification, which is the basis of many modern sociological models, is based on the Marxist model. The innovation of the Weberian theory is the multidimensional approach to stratification that views it not only in terms of socio-economic class but rather as a complex interplay of wealth, prestige and political power [4, p. 4-9].

Being the political and industrial centre of the British Empire, England has been a place of considerable social stratification since the beginning of the industrial revolution. The historical period of the Victorian Era (1837-1901) coincided with the industrial revolution, which occurred at the end of the 18th century, which is the time when the modern class structure of England formed. Thus, we find it more helpful to adhere to the sociological theories of the time and view the class distinction as stemming from a difference in socio-economic class and social status rather than using more modern theories and classifications of class distinction.

The English are a highly class-conscious society with a complex class structure [5, p. 8]. "In England, modern society is indisputably most highly and classically developed in economic structure. Nevertheless, even here the stratification of classes does not appear in its pure form. Middle and intermediate strata even here obliterate lines of demarcation everywhere (although incomparably less in rural districts than in the cities)" [6, p. 870]. Therefore, the Victorian society has a distinct class of workers and a distinct class of capitalists, which are today known as the lower class and the middle class respectively, as well as a residual class of aristocracy (upper class), which is the legacy of the bygone feudal system [7, p. 15]. By "obliterating lines of demarcation" Marx means the phenomenon of social mobility, i.e. movement of individuals between social strata which was a new phenomenon at the time. From this observation the six major characteristics of the social structure of Victorian England listed below emerge.

1. The urban society is divided into three main strata.

2. The upper class (independent of the two other classes) is a residual feature of the feudal system. Its sole defining characteristic is the aristocratic bloodline. Wealth, property, education, and other factors are irrelevant, so no social mobility is possible among the upper and the other classes. It is also the richest class as the ancestors' property is inherited by the offspring, thus considerable wealth can accumulate with time. This is the class with the highest wealth, prestige and political power.

3. The lower and the middle classes are in capitalist relations and they exhibit a certain degree of social mobility between themselves. A person originating in the lower class can theoretically rise to the middle class by acquiring capital. A person originating in the middle class can theoretically descend into the lower class by losing their capital. Wealth is the main distinguishing feature of these classes.

4. Due to social mobility, many intermediate classes exist beneath the upper class. The upper-middle class (lower-upper class) is the wealthiest of them, possessing more prestige and political power than the others, but still less than the aristocracy. The middle-middle and the lower-middle classes possess less wealth and little to no prestige and political power. These classes fall under the Marxist concept of bourgeoisie.

5. The lower class (working class/proletariat) possesses the least wealth, prestige and political power. They usually do not own the place they leave in, struggle with poverty, have no accumulated wealth, little to no education, and poor health condition [8, p. 42].

6. The social structure of Victorian England is a hybrid of the feudal system with no class mobility and the newer class system of capitalist economy with social position depending directly on the socio-economic class. A common categorisation is as follows: the upper class, upper-middle class, middle-middle class, lower-middle class, and lower class [9, p. 8].

The perception of a person's class by the society is defined not only by their ancestry, education or occupation, but also by their behaviour and language [10, p. 33], which has historically been seen as an integral part of class distinction, particularly in the English society. Thus, linguistic differences among social classes may not stem from education and intelligence, but rather from an altogether different mode of speech acquired by a person during their childhood from their environment.

Bernstein [11, p. 46] states that "the measurable interstatus differences in language facility result from entirely different *modes* of speech found within the middle class and the lower working class. [...] The two distinct forms of language use arise because the organisation of the two social strata is such that different emphases are placed on language potential. Once the emphasis or stress is placed, the resulting forms of language-use

progressively orient the speakers to distinct and different types of relationships to objects and persons. Specific speech features of a particular social class comprise a sociolect". He offers a binary opposition of the lower classes' and the higher classes' sociolects and refers to the second sociolect as to that of the middle class. In reality, the sociolect of the upper class is not distinct from that of the middle class in his classification, so Bernstein's term 'elaborated code' may be applied to both. The speech modes are defined in terms of relative frequency with which certain structural elements are selected for expression of meaning [12, p. 85].

The typical speech mode of the middle class is "one where speech becomes an object of special perceptual activity and a *theoretical attitude* is developed towards the structural possibilities of sentence organisation. This speech mode facilitates the verbal elaboration of subjective intent, sensitivity to the implications of separateness and difference, and points to the possibilities inherent in a complex conceptual hierarchy for the organization of experience" [13, p. 46].

The working class, on the other hand, is limited to a form of language that "discourages the speaker from verbally elaborating subjective intent and progressively orients the user to descriptive, rather than abstract, concepts" [14, p. 46]. It may be characterised as "a restricted highly-predictable code", while the speech of the middle class is "an elaborated code which is much less predictable." Code-switching is a possibility for the upper and middle class, who may choose to use the restricted language of the lower class, but not for the members of the lower class, who only have access to one code. The way the restricted code is used by the members of higher classes does not significantly differ from the way it is used by the lower classes [15, p. 86], which proves the existence of two separate speech modes that are perceived and distinguished by English speakers.

The features that characterise the restricted code used by the lower classes are: (1) restriction on the use of total adjectives, uncommon adjectives, adverbs, and conjunctions; (2) relative simplicity of verbal constructions, preference for less complex verbal stems; (3) infrequent use of passive constructions; (4) low proportion of subordination; (5) higher relative frequency of personal pronoun use when compared to other words (the pronouns "you" and "they" are particularly favoured); (6) frequent use of words with the function of sympathetic circularity, e.g. "isn't it", "you know", "ain't it", "wouldn't he", etc.; (7) the speech is descriptive, narrative, non-individuated, and sociocentric; (8) tendency to condense meaning and avoid redundancy. [16, p. 86-90]

The elaborated code used by higher classes comprises [17, p. 86-90]: (1) more frequent use of total adjectives, uncommon adjectives, adverbs, and

conjunctions; (2) use of more complex verbal constructions and more complex verbal stems; (3) more frequent use of passive constructions; (4) frequent use of subordination; (5) lower relative frequency of personal pronoun use when compared to other words (when used, the pronoun "I" is favoured to other pronouns); (6) the speech is reflective, abstract, individuated, and egocentric; (7) higher quantity of redundant elements, elaborative constructions, formal constructions.

Another general distinction made between sociolects is based on how closely they correspond to the recommended standard pronunciation. Higher classes, particularly the upper middle class, tend to be more clear and intelligible, whereas the lower classes are less clear and intelligible [18, p. 30]. Historically, the difference in the English sociolects comes from discrepancies in education, occupation, and in part from classism. Fox states that the upper classes use the prestige standard variety of English, while the lower classes' speech is influenced by their vernacular dialects. The higher classes' sociolects tend to exhibit influence from foreign languages that were considered prestige at some point in the history of England, i.e. Greek, Latin, and French. The sociolect of the poorly educated working class contains many features found in regional English dialects and are often influenced by territorially close languages, i.e. Dutch, Low German and Celtic languages of the British Isles [19, p. 116].

The middle classes may try to imitate the language of the upper class, but they still exhibit peculiar characteristics of the lower class sociolects. Excessive foreignisation of speech, the use of borrowed words, especially from French, and hyperforeignisms are characteristic of the middle middle and the lower middle class sociolects [20, p. 32]. The upper class, on the other hand, may decide to avoid using the language of the lower classes because of class prejudice. A continuum is thus formed: the higher the speaker's class the closer their speech is to the literary norm, the lower the speaker's class the more vernacular their speech is and the more deviant forms are used [21, p. 119].

Both Fox and Knowles note the similarity that can be observed in the phonology of the upper class sociolect and the lower class sociolect in some cases [22, p. 120; 23, p. 30]. Among these features are reduction of the terminal nasal consonant [ŋ], omission of the syllable-initial voiceless glottal fricative [h], merging of the open-mid back vowel [ɔ] with the open back vowel [ɒ], and rhotacisation of the back rounded vowels [24, p. 120].

Knowles points out that "ascertaining the standard language essentially became a middle-class activity. The social value of variation in language is that 'correct' forms can be used as social symbols and distinguish middle-class people from those they regard as common and vulgar" [25, p. 120].

The similarities among the phonological features of the lower and the upper classes may be explained by their common negligent and careless attitude to pronunciation. This mainly concerns the phonetic features of the two sociolects, as the lexis, grammar, and syntax of the upper class sociolect will differ significantly and will be more similar to the middle class sociolect. On the contrary, pronunciation of the middle class is highly careful and cautious in its adherence to the norm. A peculiar feature of the middle class sociolect is the hyperforeignisation of pronunciation, i.e. pronouncing loanwords according to the phonetic system of the donor language.

The same often applies to the choice of lexis. The middle class prefers lexical units of foreign origin, whereas the upper class and the lower class are more likely to use native English lexis instead [26, p. 30]. As a result, the speech of the middle class is distinct both from that of the lower and the upper class in its strict adherence to the standard language pronunciation, and in its predisposition to excessive foreignisation.

The phonological features of upper class sociolect are: reduction of unstressed vowels; omission of personal pronouns, articles, conjunctions [27, p. 31]; omission of the syllable-initial voiceless glottal fricative [h]; reduction of the terminal nasal consonant [ŋ]; merging of the open-mid back vowel [ɔ] with the open back vowel [ɒ]; rhotacisation of the back rounded vowels [28, p. 120].

The phonological features of the lower class sociolect are: tendency towards contracted forms and omission of vowels and consonants; omission of the syllable-initial voiceless glottal fricative [h]; reduction of the terminal nasal consonant [ŋ]; merging of the open-mid back vowel [ɔ] with the open back vowel [ɒ]; rhotacisation of the back rounded vowels [29, p.115-120]; mispronunciation, deviant dialectal forms; glottalisation of the phoneme [t] and its realisation as the glottal stop [ʔ]; fronting of the dental fricatives [θ] and [ð] and their realisation as [f] and [v]; devoicing of the velar stop [g] and its realisation as [k]; raising of the front unrounded vowel [a] or elongating of the phoneme; diphthongisation of the close front unrounded vowel [i] into [ɔɪ] [30, p. 31].

The object of our comparative stylistic analysis was speech acts containing politeness formulae, phatic expressions, and formulaic language used by the lower-class, middle-class, and upper-class characters, extracted from the novel and its Russian translation basing on the method of continuous sampling. Of them 8 fragments represent the upper-class sociolect, 2 fragments represent the middle-class sociolect, and 3 fragments – the lower-class sociolect. The fragments have been excerpted from the chapters in which the characters are introduced for the first time, as a

character's social class is expected to be clearly conveyed through their speech upon their introduction.

The fragments are organised in tables. Each table displays text fragments of each semantic group pertaining to each of the social classes discussed. Excerpts from the translation are presented next the original text, and the phrases that are subject to analysis are highlighted. The main features that characterise each fragment are listed below the respective fragment. The analysis of each group of excerpts is conducted after each table.

The excerpts of the upper-class speech that contain politeness formulae, phatic expressions and formulaic language have been divided into three semantic groups: *Attracting attention*, *Thanking*, and *Apologising*.

Table 1. Politeness formulae in the upper-class sociolect

Content	English	Russian
Attracting attention	**'I beg your pardon**,' he said, turning and **removing his hat**; **'pray excuse me**.'	- **Простите**, - сказал он, поворачиваясь к ней и **снимая шляпу**, - **прошу прощенья.**
	• Politeness formula for attracting attention – *I beg your pardon* • Non-verbal etiquette – *removing his hat* • Politeness formula of apology – *pray excuse me*	• Politeness formulae for attracting attention – *простите* and *прошу прощенья* • Non-verbal etiquette– *снимая шляпу* • Colloquial/archaic lexis – *прощенья*
Thanking	**'Thank you**. **Allow me**.' **He placed a chair for her**, but remained himself **carelessly lounging** against the table.	- **Спасибо**. **Разрешите мне**. - **Он пододвинул ей стул**, сам же, не садясь, **небрежно прислонился** к краю стола.
	• Politeness formula of gratitude – *thank you* • Politeness formula preceding a polite gesture – *allow me* • Non-verbal etiquette – *placed a chair for her* • Non-verbal element describing manner – *remained himself carelessly lounging*	• Politeness formula of gratitude – *спасибо* • Politeness formula preceding a polite gesture – *разрешите мне* • Non-verbal etiquette – *пододвинул ей стул* • Non-verbal element describing manner – *небрежно прислонился*

		'Assuredly,' said the stranger. 'Much obliged to you for reminding me.	- Разумеется, - отвечал приезжий. - Спасибо, что напомнили.
		• Adverb – *assuredly* • Politeness formula of gratitude – *much obliged* • Gerund – *reminding*	• Formulaic language – *разумеется* • Politeness formula of gratitude – *спасибо*
		'Thank you.'	- Благодарю вас.
		'Thousand thanks,'	- Премного благодарен
		• Politeness formulae of gratitude	• Politeness formulae of gratitude
Apologising		'Which I accordingly venture, with all suitable apologies, to do.'	- Что я и позволю себе сделать, принося тысячу извинений.
		• Politeness formula of apology in a subordinate clause – *with all suitable apologies* • Literary lexis – *venture* • Adverb – *accordingly*	• Colloquial idiomatic construction – *позволю себе сделать* • Politeness formula of apology in a form of a transgressive – *принося тысячу извинений*
		'Excuse my impertinent curiosity …	- Простите мое назойливое любопытство…
		• Politeness formula of apology – *excuse my ...* • Formal adjective – *impertinent*	• Politeness formula of apology – *простите ...* • Pejorative/bookish adjective – *назойливое*
		'Pray excuse my intrusion. Many thanks. Good day!'	- Еще раз простите меня за вторжение. Тысячу благодарностей. До свиданья!
		• Politeness formula of apology – *pray excuse* • Politeness formula of gratitude – *many thanks* • Phatic expression – *good day*	• Politeness formula of apology – *простите меня* • Politeness formula of gratitude – *тысячу благодарностей* • Phatic expression – *до свиданья* • Colloquial/archaic lexis – *свиданья*

The table displays politeness formulae used in the upper-class sociolect. There is one formula for attracting attention – *I beg your pardon*; four different formulae expressing gratitude – *thank you, much obliged, thousand thanks,* and *many thanks;* three different formulae expressing apology – *excuse, pray excuse,* and *with all suitable apologies*; one formula accompanying a polite gesture – *allow me*; one phatic expression – *good day.* The same number of different constructions is used in the translation and their variety is fully preserved.

There are uncommon lexical units of Latin origin, including the adverbs *assuredly* and *accordingly*, the adjective *impertinent*, the verb *venture*, and the noun *intrusion.* The Russian translation differs. *Assuredly* is translated with a formulaic expression *разумеется*. *Impertinent* and *intrusion* have been translated as *назойливое* and *вторжение*, which are Slavic bookish words rather than borrowings. *Accordingly venture* is translated using a colloquial idiomatic construction *позволю себе сделать.* The translation of the gerund *reminding* is stylistically neutral.

The determined non-verbal elements provide the following characteristics of the upper class: elaborate etiquette language and manners (removing one's hat when greeting a woman, offering a seat), careless attitude. The non-verbal behaviour is transferred faithfully without omissions.

While there is little difference between politeness formulae and non-verbal elements in the original and the translation, the uncommon lexis is treated differently. The lexis of Latin origin serves as a clear indicator of a higher-class sociolect in the English text, whereas in the Russian text the social class in conveyed by bookish Slavic lexis, a formulaic expression, and an idiomatic expression. The archaic/colloquial form of the phrase *до свиданья* and the colloquial idiom *позволю себе сделать* should be noted, as no indication of colloquial style is found in the original.

The excerpts of the middle-class speech that contain phatic expressions and formulaic language have been divided into two semantic groups: *Valedictions* and *Answering questions*.

Table 2. Politeness formulae in the middle-class sociolect

Content	English	Russian
Valedictions	**'Good-bye, Louisa!'**	**- До свидания, Луиза!**
	• Phatic expression – *good-bye* • Direct address – *Louisa*	• Phatic expression – *до свидания* • Direct address – *Луиза*

Answering questions	**'No!'**	**- Ничего подобного!**
	• Formulaic language – *no* • Exclamation	• Emphatic colloquial idiom – *ничего подобного* • Exclamation

The prominent features are the use of the direct address by name (*Louisa!*) and short emphatic constructions. The first excerpt is translated faithfully, whereas in the second excerpt an emphatic colloquial idiom *ничего подобного* is used instead of the short formulaic answer *no*. The spelling of the Russian phatic expression *до свидания* should be noted, as it differs from the archaic/colloquial spelling *до свиданья* used by the translator in the upper-class discourse.

The excerpts of the lower-class speech that contain phatic expressions and formulaic language have been divided into two semantic groups: *Valedictions* and *Answering questions*.

Table 3. Politeness formulae in the lower-class sociolect

Content	English	Russian
Valedictions	'Good night, dear lass; good night!'	- **Покойной** ночи, **дорогая**, спи спокойно!
	• Phatic expression – *good night* • Colloquial/dialectal lexis – *lass* • Term of endearment – *dear* • Repetition – *good night*	• Archaic lexis – *покойной* • Phatic expression – *покойной ночи* • Term of endearment – *дорогая*
Answering questions	'Yes,' he said, **with a slow nod or two**.	- **Да**, - сказал он, **качнув головой**.
	• Formulaic language – *yes* • Non-verbal element (head movement) – *with a slow nod or two*	• Formulaic language – *да* • Non-verbal element (head movement) – *качнув головой*
	'**No, sir, sure** I **ha' not coom** for **nowt o' th'** kind.'	- **Нет**, **сэр**, я **вовсе** не за этим пришел.
	• Formulaic language – *no* • Direct address with an honorific – *sir* • Colloquial lexis – *sure* • Contractions – *ha', o', th'* • Vowel substitution – *coom* • Dialectal lexis – *nowt* • Double negation – *ha' not coom for nowt o' th' kind*	• Formulaic language – *нет* • Direct address with an honorific – *sir* • Colloquial lexis – *вовсе*

134

The English text is characterised by the use of colloquial and dialectal lexis (*lass, sure, nowt*), repetition, direct address (*dear lass, sir*), non-standard pronunciation indicated by graphons (contractions *ha', o', th'* and vowel substitution *coom*), non-standard grammatical constructions (double negation), and non-verbal communication by head movements.

In the translation, direct address, formulaic language and non-verbal elements are preserved. Archaic and colloquial lexis (*покойной, вовсе*) is used instead of dialectal lexis. No graphons and no deviant grammatical constructions are found. The translation is considerably more neutral overall, with the two main features that differentiate the lower class sociolect (non-standard grammar and pronunciation) being completely lost and not substituted in any way.

Thus, the analysis has proved that the characters' sociolectal distinction, which is expressed through verbal and non-verbal means in the text of the original novel, has been partially preserved in the translation. The non-verbal elements have been translated faithfully, but the verbal means of depiction of a character's sociolect differ in the original novel and in the translation.

The middle-class sociolect has been translated the most faithfully, having maintained its characteristic features in the translation. The upper-class sociolect has been transferred less precisely. Politeness and educated speech are indicators of the upper-class sociolect in the original text, whereas in the translation, upper-class sociolect is indicated by the careless and condescending manner of the speaker. This distinction may stem from the differences in the social structure and the attitude towards the aristocracy in the times of Victorian England and the Soviet Union.

The least faithful translation is that of the lower-class discourse. All of its characteristic dialectal and deviant features have been lost. The discrepancies between the depiction of the lower-class sociolect in the original text and in the translation may stem from the notion of "linguistic norm", which is considered to be of utmost importance by the Russian linguists and is enforced in all printed publications. Due to this factor, accurate depiction of the lower-class sociolect, which does not comply with the linguistic norm, is effectively impossible in print.

References
1.-2. Sorokin P. (1928). *Contemporary Sociological Theories*. New York: Harper & Brothers. **3.** Marx K., Engels F. (1998). *Capital. Volume III*. London: Lawrence & Wishart. **4.** Добреньков В.И., Кравченко А.И. (2000). *Социология: 2 том. Социальная стратификация и мобильность*. Москва: ИНФРА-М. **5.** Fox K. (2004). *Watching the English*. London: Hodder & Stoughton. **6.** Marx K., Engels F. (1998). *Capital.*

Volume III. London: Lawrence & Wishart. **7.-8.** Saunders P. (2001). *Social Class and Stratification.* London: Routledge. **9.-10**. Fox K. (2004). *Watching the English*. London: Hodder & Stoughton. **11.-17.** Bernstein B. (2003). *Class, Codes and Control.* London: Routledge. **18.** Fox K. (2004). *Watching the English*. London: Hodder & Stoughton. **19.** Knowles G. (1997) *A Cultural History of the English Language*. Bodmin, Cornwall: MPG Books Ltd. **20.** Fox K. (2004). *Watching the English*. London: Hodder & Stoughton. **21.-22.** Knowles G. (1997) *A Cultural History of the English Language*. Bodmin, Cornwall: MPG Books Ltd. **23.** Fox K. (2004). *Watching the English*. London: Hodder & Stoughton. **24.-25.** Knowles G. (1997) *A Cultural History of the English Language*. Bodmin, Cornwall: MPG Books Ltd. **26.-27.** Fox K. (2004). *Watching the English*. London: Hodder & Stoughton. **28.-29.** Knowles G. (1997) *A Cultural History of the English Language*. Bodmin, Cornwall: MPG Books Ltd. **30.** Fox K. (2004). *Watching the English*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Татьяна Тарасенко
г. Красноярск, Российская Федерация

Ритуальное винопитие в Китае и его отражение в русском переводе романа Мо Яня «Страна вина»

Ritual wine-drinking in China served to maintain the social system and the world order, which is reflected in Russian translation of Yang Mo's novel "The Republic of Wine". In the novel there are social, household and everyday rituals associated with wine drinking.

Keywords: "The Republic of Wine", Yang Mo, wine, ritual wine-drinking

В данной работе мы хотели рассмотреть, как винопитие, являющееся основной темой романа Мо Яня «Страна вина», действие которого происходит в современном Китае, связано с традициями ритуального винопития древности.

Мо Янь, настоящее имя Гуань Моэ, стал известен мировому читателю после вручения ему в 2012 году Нобелевской премии по литературе «за его галлюцинаторный реализм, который объединяет народные сказки с историей и современностью» (http://noblit.ru/Yan). Перевод китайского романа Мо Яня (1992) «Страна вина» выполнен Игорем Егоровым [4]. Одна из тем романа посвящена нравам обитателей мифической страны Цзю Гоу, в которой вся жизнь вращается вокруг вина. Один из главных героев повествования, следователь Дин Гоуэр, высокопоставленный чиновник, прибывает в Цзю Гуо для расследования.