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**Abstract**

This research deals with revealing various linguistic units: lexemes and collocations within the framework of semantic fields of notional components of the category of deviation that are reflected in the works of professional translators, Michael Glenny, Richard Pevear, and Larissa Volokhonsky of *The Master and Margarita* by Mikhail Bulgakov in the English language. The author takes the method of conceptual analysis of the linguistic units of expressing different parts of semantic fields of components of the mental unit of deviation in English as the basic one here. Lexemes and collocations are also the focus of a contextual method of reviewing the translators’ approaches to the linguistic units of the work under analysis. Different semantic spheres based on personal and professional experience of Michael Glenny, Richard Pevear, and Larissa Volokhonsky reflect the category of deviation in translations of the novel under study. This category includes the central part and periphery. The central part implies the lexemes and collocations of neutral-bookish style, and the periphery means lexical units of informal style. The author also distinguishes the interpretative field within the semantic fields of the category of deviation. The results given in this article can be a basis for comparative analysis of translations within one language or as a source of a contrastive analysis of literary works.
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**Introduction**

Semantic categories are cognitive ones here because they include not only the data from dictionaries but they also mean personal experience of perception of the phenomena under study from the sight of translators. They imply the characteristics of lexical units in certain contexts (Hart, 2019). Categories are not limited by such words or collocations, the whole context may refer to this category. A certain class of words, which form a conceptual space, usually presents the category (Evans, 2018; Lakoff, 2018). Thus, various lexical units can express the same category: lexemes, collocations, and phraseological units (Cruse, 1992, 1995).

Categorization is an automatic process, which helps to classify natural and abstract phenomena (Kemmerer, 2019). Thus, the comparative analysis of the category of deviation in English helps to reveal how a translator thinks and reflects the ideas of the original mental unit under study. Such abstract categories like deviation play a significant role in understanding the processes of thinking (Everett, 2019). They define lacunas within the semantic fields of mental units and reflect the data in turns to various objects and events (Lakoff, 2005).

A category implies a certain concept, which is always determined by society, culture, and personal environment of a person (Winters & Nathan, 2020, p. 32; Sharifian, 2017). Thus, categorization can be defined as a system of concepts that are culturally marked (Janda, 2018; Kövecses, 2006, p. 3). The key word that characterizes the mental unit as the most abstract phenomenon and its synonyms express the category. Synonyms to the key word of the category and their related words are also the contents of the mental unit. It concerns concepts of physical and abstract character. Such lexical units define the central part in the semantic field of the category.

The contextual analysis and the analysis of the lexis of slang origin or euphemisms consider other semantic features of the category. Another good resource of revealing the category is paroemias. Lexical units that are included into the
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semantic space of one category can express the meanings within the boundaries of other mental units. Thus, the semantic field of any category has its stable and non-fixed elements of expression. Moreover, there are lexical units that can be included into different parts of the semantic fields of the same category because they can be lexemes and collocations of various styles (neutral, colloquial, euphemistic ones).

The analysis of the fields within two translations of original text reveals the differences of the semantic categories in the sense of their structure. For instance, the means of expressing the category of deviation included into proper semantic fields are characterized by their different stylistic nature in terms of various translations of The Master and Margarita in English. Thus, the translation can demonstrate the change of the semantic structure of the category within another language: It helps to define the differences and similarities in the function of categories in various types of perception based on social factors. Every semantic category presupposes its specific components. The lexical units that dominate in the experience of this or that translator express these components of the semantic field of the category.

**Literature Review**

The structure of the categories can be given in different ways (Reboul, 2017, p. 115). The classical way of presenting categories considers them as systems of various levels of abstraction (Dancygier, 2017). Both linguistic and non-linguistic categories can imply the structure of basic elements and their components of upper abstraction (Rosch, 2013, p. 312).

E. Rosch and V. Eynde (1996) tended to distinguish the prototypes of the categories. E. Rosch (1975) considered prototypes as the centers of the semantic categories (p. 382). Such centers imply the characteristics that can belong to all the elements of the mental unit. R. Välismaa-Blum (2011) added the term “best examples” as the synonym of prototypes, saying about the centers of the semantic categories (p. 33).

Ch. J. Fillmore and Atkins (2000) stated that polysemantic lexemes might be prototypes. Moreover, some of the scholars found it possible to single out phraseological units within the semantic category, which includes the elements considered as prototypes (Leech & Li, 1995, p. 183).

Nowadays, cognitive linguistics uses the prototype ideas to define the central elements of the semantic fields of the categories (Pushshkin, 2009, p. 172). These linguistic units are the most frequently used lexemes and collocations. We consider a prototype as a kind of the semantic field of the category of deviation, which reflects the views about norm and deviation in a social group and includes linguistic units that express these views.

Frame semantics also considers the semantic space of the category (Faber, 2012). It focuses on conceptual domains. Every member of such a domain has some characteristics of the semantic field. The peculiarity of the domain is the presence of specific features that differentiate the members. Such interpretation of semantic categories is very close to the idea implied in this work, because the objective of such theory is to describe the meanings of lexical units by deriving them from contextual environment. The only difference between this method and the method of conceptual analysis used in this work is that the construction of frame structure of the category requires a large amount of texts taken from corpora (Baker et al., 2003).

A. Tyler (2012) defines a semantic category as a word, which forms a network of meanings that are closely related to each other. This view is very close to that revealed by A. Taylor et al. (2009; A. Taylor, 2019). Cognitive anthropologists consider them, analyzing the lexicon; the focus of their investigation is the cognitive structure of the domain under study (Cohen & Lefebvre, 2005). Thus, they have similar approach to categories as linguists in comparison with philosophers, whose task is to consider the categories from the point of experience (Rey, 2005).

Some of the scholars reveal the hierarchy of semantic categories, which implies taxonomic internal structure with different levels (Feist, 2016). Such approach defines the category as a flexible phenomenon, analyzing the nature of the structure and the role of the elements distinguished.

D. Geeraerts (2009) offers to use the same flexibility of categories in terms of concepts. R. Jackendoff (1992) defines the semantic structure from the sight of the so-called conceptual semantics. As H. Cuyckens et al. (2009) state, the central part of study within cognitive linguistics concerns the analysis of lexical units, word classes, and grammatical constructions that are also conceptual categories. Thus, the information about contextual and conceptual analyses presupposes the theories of cognitive linguistics (Langacker, 2010, 2017; Wierzbicka, 1985).

P. Corson (1996) refers to conceptual categories as knowledge ones. D. Geeraerts (2012) distinguishes supra-lexical mental units.

We agree with the statement by L. Sylvester (1994) that the categories are the collection of ideas that “make up” the semantic fields (p. 241).

The semantic fields are sets of lexical units that are in close or distant relations in accordance with their prototypical meaning. Such lexical units are the object of conceptual analysis in a certain context (Evans & Pourcel, 2009; Evans, 2019). The semantic fields of all lexical units referring to mental and physiological anomalies, for example, reflect the lexical structure of the category “deviation.”

The types of semantic fields of the same category are not similar in terms of cultures (Akmajian & Demer, 2001). The semantic fields of the source and the target languages are different, if the meanings of lexical units in translation are not stable (Vandervoorde, 2020).

J. Holmes (1988) states that the semantic fields of lexical units of one language never fully coincide with the semantic
fields of lexemes and phrases of another language. Moreover, the semantic fields of the same phenomenon within one language may differ depending on the personal experience of the translator. For instance, the category of deviation is seen here in the sense of semantic fields in translations by Michael Glenny, Richard Pevear, and Larissa Volokhonsky in English.

Elements of the above-mentioned semantic field belong to different levels of abstraction within two translations in English (Ptashkin, 2018, p. 60). It is preferable to consider semantic fields in the framework of translations under analysis as concepts and they define the senses of lexical units; at the same time, they are in the light of semasiological approach (Allan, 2010).

This work deals with semantic fields that include the core and peripheries. The core includes the bright examples of the semantic field: basic lexemes that characterize the category in general, their synonyms, and collocations (Wierzbicka, 1984, p. 313). Semantic borders of peripheries are less structured (Abbou & Baider, 2016, p. 3). The category of deviation, like all the categories, has its own peripheral components; they mean some of the characteristics of the primary semantics but they can also represent another category (Croft & Cruse, 2004). This view coincides with ideas of J. R. Taylor (2003) who singled out family resemblance and radial network structures (A. Taylor et al., 2009). D. Geeraerts (2019) stated that radial structure includes core parts of the category and a network of other members. He called non-central members “a variant on a variant” (Geeraerts, 2008, p. 109).

The semantic structure of peripheries implies paroemias, sayings. Even the completely literary work can reflect the contents of a certain semantic field (Allwood, 1999). We also offer the interpretative field as the distant periphery of the semantic space of the components within the category of deviation.

The structure of the semantic space of the category of deviation in the text The Master and Margarita by Mikhail Bulgakov means lexis revealed in the contextual analysis. The central part in the semantic field of the category of deviation in this novel is a polycentric phenomenon, including mental and physiological components (Ptashkin, 2018, p. 61).

The object of the following work is to analyze the semantic space of the core, peripheries in the translations of the above-mentioned literary work by Michael Glenny, Richard Pevear, and Larissa Volokhonsky.

Method

Methods of contextual and conceptual analyses were used to consider the semantic fields of the category of deviation in the novel “The Master and Margarita” in English. The meanings of lexical units revealed in this context are the focus of conceptual analysis. The meanings of these lexical units in the boundaries of dictionaries are also of great importance in the sense of understanding the semantic structure of the category of deviation.

This work distinguishes the phases of analysis, following the main purpose of the study. It is necessary to reveal the key lexical unit of the semantic field of the category. Such a lexeme is “deviation.” It functions as the primary semantic element of the semantic space under study. It characterizes the category of deviation as a whole.

Then the author considers lexical environment of the literary work The Master and Margarita in the light of the terms belonging to the sphere of the category of deviation within the translations by (a) Michael Glenny; (b) Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky. These are lexemes and collocations. They stand as the nearest synonyms to the primary lexeme of the category of deviation or related words. Such related lexical units characterize the semantic fields of the category of deviation in other parts of this structure. An interest of comparative analysis here is to define the lexemes, collocations, and phraseological units of the semantic field of the category of deviation. These linguistic units differ in the position of the semantic space under study.

The third phase of the analysis means the formation of the macrostructure of the category of deviation in two types of translation of The Master and Margarita; we focus on the meanings received in the contextual analysis. Lexical units of all styles that indicate mental and physiological deviations are the subject of analysis. They form the core and peripheries of the semantic space of the category of deviation. Lexeme and collocations of informal style refer to the peripheries of the semantic fields of the category of deviation.

Moreover, paroemias, aphorisms, and biblical words occupy the distant periphery of this semantic space. Even the whole passages revealed in the contexts indicate certain deviations, that is, why they are also the means of expressing the interpretative field of the category in the translations given.

The author states that the interpretative field of the category under study means the distant periphery of the semantic field of the category of deviation; it includes passages that characterize anomalies; means of expressing the category of deviation are not given directly. The conceptual analysis includes various phases; the author excludes some of these phases, following the main purpose of the research. The borders of the literary work under study limit all semantic fields; we find it unreasonable to form derivational fields of the primary word, to define the synonyms, taking into account dictionaries. Thus, the structure of conceptual analysis may vary depending on the purpose of linguistic consideration.

The purpose of conceptual and contextual methods is to point out the differences in the semantic structure of the category of deviation in two translations of the above-mentioned literary work. The data about contrastive analysis is out of focus in this article.
Discussion / Analysis

The main idea of this article implies the comparative analysis of lexis in two versions of *The Master and Margarita* done by famous translators: M. Glenny, R. Pevear, and L. Volokhonsky. Such analysis helps to reveal the peculiar features of the structure of the semantic fields of the same category in the consciousness of specialists under study. The data of conceptual method under the support of functional grammar revealed the main components within the category of deviation. The author of this article deals with the phenomenon “semantic fields” based on scientific works in the sphere of functional grammar and cognitive linguistics (Jackendoff, 1983; Weise, 1997). Thus, the structure of this category is the mental unit with the sphere called “the core” with lexical units of neutral-bookish style and peripheries (Rosch, 2015).

We think that the brightest examples of any semantic field characterize the peripheral parts of the category. They define the direct speech of the characters. In general, both translations use the lexis of neutral-bookish style in cases of inner speech. The interpretative field of the category also describes the situations without using the lexical units that actualize the direct meanings of the semantic fields of this concept. The author considers the basic lexemes that characterize the category in general, taking into account the theory of prototypes (Wierzbicka, 2014). They are the starting point for a reconstruction of the semantic space of the category.

The lexemes of high abstraction: anomaly, deviation, inferiority, deviation characterize the category of deviation. They are the primary lexemes that define the core of the semantic fields of the category of deviation. The author mentioned that terms in the previous works, demonstrating two approaches to the structure of the semantic category: (a) in terms of vertical hierarchy; (b) in the light of theories of semantic fields (Ptashkin, 2009, 2018).

The number of elements within the semantic fields of the category of deviation varies depending on the worldview of translators, their inner perception of reality. The comparative analysis in touch with the conceptual method helps to verify the structural elements by means of consideration of the key lexical units in special contexts. The translations of *The Master and Margarita* reflect the contents of the semantic fields of the category of deviation in another linguistic worldview. It is a promising aspect to analyze the category of deviation in the sense of contrastive analysis.

The lexical units of the semantic fields of the category of deviation within the novel *The Master and Margarita* by Mikhail Bulgakov are lexemes, collocations, and phraseological units. Each component of these semantic fields presupposes specific features of reality, cultural peculiarities of the original. All the parts of the semantic space of the above-mentioned category: the core, near and distant peripheries observe these components. The author did not take euphemisms for special consideration in the boundaries of this work. They do not occupy a large space in this book.

The contextual analysis defined the key lexical units that characterize the core and peripheries of the semantic fields of the mental and physiological components of the category of deviation in the work *The Master and Margarita*: mentally ill, mental hospital, schizophrenia, weak in the head, halfwit, mutilate, maim, disfigure, mad, painfully, sick, insane, crazy, go out of his mind, lunatic, abnormal state, carbuncle, and so on.

They function as the general terms that define the core or they are further concretization of the semantic fields: medical terms, meaning deviations in emotions and behavior; lexical units, actualizing psychological anomalies; lexical units, denoting mental deviations; medical terms, expressing the meanings of deviations in physiology; and lexical units, denoting physiological diseases. Thus, we analyzed the lexical units that actualize the meanings of mental and physiological nature and belong to different styles in the novel *The Master and Margarita* by Mikhail Bulgakov in English.

The distinguished units prove the fact that the semantic fields originally formed in the atmosphere of another language undergo transformations in accordance with the methods of translating. The author supposes that new semantic fields were forming in terms of another culture. All lexical units of English have their history of forming in the boundaries of quite different linguistic worldviews.

The novel *The Master and Margarita* is a power source of information about mental units of deviation and their differences of perception in two cultures. The conceptual analysis of this text revealed the polysemic nature of the above-mentioned lexical units. They can indicate real pathologies or characterize a person with strange behavior.

This article also demonstrates the structure of the semantic fields of mental and physiological components of the category of deviation in the translations of the novel *The Master and Margarita* from the sight of the analysis of linguistic resources in the sphere of cognitive linguistics and functional grammar. Taking into account theoretical data and the semantic analysis of the text, the author defined the following semantic parts of the mental and physiological components: medical terms, denoting deviations in emotions and behavior; lexical units, denoting psychological anomalies; lexical units, denoting mental deviations; medical terms, denoting deviations in physiology; and lexical units, denoting physiological diseases.

Each of these parts can function as a mental unit of high abstraction or as an essential part of other concepts in the framework of a certain text or it can be independent in no connection to the category of higher abstraction. This article considers the above-mentioned units in terms of medicine, everyday usage, and literary components. It includes medical terms into the core of the semantic fields of the mental and physiological components of the category of deviation.

The peculiar feature of the text *The Master and Margarita* is the presence of the lexical units that belong to both semantic fields of mental and physiological components of
the category of deviation or they can be met within the boundaries of one component. For instance, the lexical unit “sick” presents mental and physiological components of the category of deviation in this novel. The above-mentioned example showed that it could actualize the meanings of the semantic fields: lexical units, denoting physiological diseases, and lexical units, denoting mental deviations, proving the fact that the semantic fields within one category intersect in case of the lexis of higher abstraction.

Moreover, the lexical units of neutral-bookish and informal styles co-exist in the semantic space of the text under study and can indicate the existence of the revealed concepts in the different world-images of Mikhail Bulgakov and his translators with their specific cultural and linguistic approaches to the text given.

**Results / Findings**

The author of this work distinguishes two types of the components within the structure of the category of deviation in the following text: mental and physiological ones (Ptashkin, 2018). The mental component consists of several semantic fields: (a) medical terms, denoting deviations in emotions and behavior; (b) lexical units, denoting psychological anomalies; and (c) lexical units, denoting mental deviations. The physiological component includes medical terms, denoting deviations in physiology; lexical units, denoting physiological diseases; and lexical units, denoting traumas. Each of these components has further specification, indicating the style: neutral-bookish or informal ones.

The revealed meanings of the means of expressing the semantic fields of the mental and physiological components of the category of deviation give us the opportunity to structure this mental unit in the following text in the framework of translations by R. Pevear, L. Volokhonsky, and M. Glenny.

R. Pevear and L. Volokhonsky (1997), describing the behavior of a stranger, whom the characters Berlioz and Bezdomny met, use the collocation “a hospital for the mentally ill.” This collocation belongs to neutral-bookish style. It refers to the central part of the semantic space in the mental component of the category of deviation and actualizes the meaning “a place of living for people suffering from mental illness.” At the same time, the collocation “mentally ill” is included into the sphere of medical terms denoting deviations in emotions and behavior.

M. Glenny (1967) prefers to use an old-fashioned collocation “mental hospital” in this case. This collocation is also included as an old-fashioned lexeme into the central part of the semantic field in the mental component of the category of deviation within the context of the narration under study. In general, this term represents the sphere of medicine. Miquel Porta and John M. Last (2018) consider it in the dictionary dedicated to medicine. The meaning of the collocation “mental hospital” coincides with the meaning revealed in the previous example.

Both translations use the direct equivalents in the passage, where Woland (Satan) explains his presence in the madhouse: “... what schizophrenia is” (Pevear & Volokhonsky, 1997), “... what schizophrenia was” (Glenny, 1967). The lexeme “schizophrenia” belongs to the core part of the semantic space of the mental component of the category of deviation. It is included into the sphere of medical terms denoting deviations in emotions and behavior (Ptashkin, 2018).

Some of the lexical units in the context of this book do not necessarily actualize their direct meanings; they do not reflect the negative meaning of a real anomaly in this context. For instance, “... weak in the head?” (Glenny, 1967); “... like a halfwit?” (Pevear & Volokhonsky, 1997). The phraseological unit “weak in the head” belongs to the neutral-bookish style and the lexeme “halfwit” is marked in the dictionaries as the unit of informal style. Thus, the phraseological unit “weak in the head” is included in the core of the semantic field lexical units, denoting psychological anomalies of the mental component of the category of deviation and the lexeme “halfwit” is a part of the near periphery of the semantic field: lexical units, denoting psychological anomalies.

Next passage deals with the story about the centurion Mark, who was injured at the battle of Idistavizo. Pilate considers this case in the dialogue with Yeshua. Ha-Nostri wanted to know who attacked the centurion. Both translations express the idea of a trauma using the lexemes of neutral-bookish style: “mutilate” (Glenny, 1967), “maim” (Pevear & Volokhonsky, 1997). They take the position of lexis in the core of the semantic field lexical units, denoting physiological diseases of the physiological component of the category of deviation. The lexeme “disfigure” actualizes its direct meaning “deform” in both translations (American Heritage, 2015).

At this stage of the conversation, Pilate thought about Ha-Nostri being an insane person: “... philosopher was mentally ill,” “... mad, Utopian preaching...” (Glenny, 1967), “... proved to be mentally ill,” “... mad utopian talk...” (Pevear & Volokhonsky, 1997). The collocation “mentally ill” and the lexeme “mad” actualize their direct meanings; they are included into the core of the semantic field lexical units, denoting mental deviations of the mental component of the category of deviation.

Pilate suffered a pain in his voice during the conversation with Yeshua. M. Glenny expresses this thought by means of an adverb “painfully”; R. Pevear and L. Volokhonsky reflect the same idea with the help of the adjective “sick” in their translation. In the boundaries of this context, the lexemes “painfully” and “sick” actualize the meaning of the core of the semantic field lexical units, denoting physiological diseases of the physiological component of the category of deviation.

Pilate addresses Yeshua naming him emotionally: “criminal lunatic” (Glenny, 1967), “insane criminal” (Pevear &
Volokhonsky, 1997). The authors of translations try to reflect the emotional condition of Pilate highlighting quite different moments. M. Glenny offers the collocation “criminal lunatic” emphasizing the behavior of the arrested person that caused a reaction of Pilate. This expression is widely used in the sphere of law. R. Pevear and L. Volokhonsky prefer to give the direct equivalent “insane criminal.” The lexeme “lunatic” in the boundaries of the collocation “criminal lunatic” actualizes its direct meaning; it is of neutral-bookish style, it is marked as an old-fashioned lexical entry. It is the representative of the core of the semantic field lexical units, denoting mental deviations of the mental component of the category of deviation. The lexeme “insane” actualizes its direct meaning in the collocation “insane criminal”; this lexical entry is marked as “general.”

Pilate compared Ha-Nostri and other arrested people and concluded that Ha-Nostri is “insane”: “an insane person” (Pevear & Volokhonsky, 1997), and “was clearly insane” (Glenny, 1967). The meanings of both contexts coincide with the meanings revealed in the previous example. The lexeme “insane” actualizes the meaning considered in the core of the semantic field lexical units, denoting mental deviations of the mental component of the category of deviation.

M. Glenny tends to include an extra phraseological unit reflecting the discussion between Pilate and Caiaphas. Pilate compares himself with Ha-Nostri: “. . . take for a fool . . . crazy young vagrant . . .” (Glenny, 1967). The phraseological unit “to take for a fool” presupposes its direct meaning “assume that somebody is foolish”; it belongs to neutral-bookish style, and it represents the core of the semantic field lexical units, denoting psychological anomalies of the category of deviation. The lexeme “crazy” is an informal lexical unit; it actualizes the meaning “a person who behaves in a stupid way, especially a person who is mentally ill.” Thus, the lexeme “crazy” refers to the near periphery of the semantic field lexical units, denoting mental deviations of the mental component of the category of deviation.

R. Pevear and L. Volokhonsky prefer to use the collocation “young vagrant holy fool . . .” in the same passage. The collocation “holy fool” belongs to neutral-bookish style; it refers to the core of the semantic field lexical units, denoting mental deviations of the mental component of the category of deviation.

The characters Berlioz and Ivan Nikolayich met Woland at Patriarch’s in Moscow. Woland predicted the death of Berlioz. Bezdomny and Berlioz decided that this gentleman suffered from a certain psychiatric disease: (a) “. . . mad German . . .”; “gone out of his mind . . .”; “. . . the professor was a lunatic”; “. . . the mad German . . .”; “. . . the madman” (Glenny, 1967); (b) “. . . a mad German; “. . . went crazy . . .”; “the professor was mad”; “. . . the half-witted German . . .”; “the sick man (Pevear & Volokhonsky, 1997).

The lexeme “mad” is represented in both translations; it actualizes the meaning of the core of the semantic field lexical units, denoting mental deviations. The lexeme “madman” is given only in the translation of M. Glenny; it belongs to the neutral-bookish style, and it represents the core of the semantic field lexical units, denoting mental deviations of the category under study.

M. Glenny uses the neutral phraseological unit “go out of mind,” which is included into the core of the semantic field lexical units, denoting mental deviations of the category of deviation, whereas R. Pevear and L. Volokhonsky use the informal phraseological unit “go crazy,” which forms the near periphery of the semantic field lexical units, denoting mental deviations.

The lexeme “lunatic” in translation by M. Glenny actualizes the meaning of the core of the semantic field lexical units, denoting mental deviations. The lexeme “half-witted” expresses the meaning of the core of two semantic fields: lexical units, denoting psychological anomalies, and lexical units, denoting mental deviations. The lexeme “sick” in the translation by R. Pevear and L. Volokhonsky represents the same meaning, observed in “madman”; it also forms the core of the semantic field lexical units, denoting mental deviations of the category of deviation.

Discussing the evil, Berlioz noticed that the foreigner started laughing because Ivan Nikolayich rejected the existence of the devil: “. . . the insane man burst out into such laughter . . .” (Pevear & Volokhonsky, 1997); “. . . the lunatic gave such a laugh . . .” (Glenny, 1967). The lexeme “insane” has its direct meaning, indicating a person with a psychiatric problem. The revealed lexeme expresses the meaning of the core of the semantic field lexical units, denoting mental deviations of the category of deviation. The lexeme “lunatic” actualizes the meaning “crazy” of the core of the semantic field lexical units, denoting mental deviations of the category of deviation.

In the boundaries of the following examples, we observe the key lexis of the semantic fields of the category of deviation and a descriptive field, which enriches the overall context of deviation. It actualizes the meaning of the semantic field lexical units, denoting mental deviations: “. . . with a typical madman’s reaction he immediately went to the other extreme, shouting angrily and harshly . . .” (Glenny, 1967); “. . . a mentally ill person . . . fell into the opposite extreme . . . became vexed . . . cried sternly . . .” (Pevear & Volokhonsky, 1997). The meanings of the lexemes “madman” and “mentally ill” coincide with the meanings revealed in the previous examples.

Berlioz had a plan to inform the foreigners’ bureau about a person from abroad being in a bad psychiatric condition: “. . . in an obviously abnormal state” (Glenny, 1967); “. . . was clearly insane” (Pevear & Volokhonsky, 1997). As for the lexeme “abnormal,” it is a lexical unit of broad semantics. It can be met in the boundaries of all semantic fields indicating deviation from a certain physiological or mental condition. In this context, this lexical unit as an essential part in the boundaries of the collocation “abnormal state” refers to the core of the semantic field lexical units, denoting
mental deviations. The lexeme “insane” is the representative of the core of the same semantic field lexical units, denoting mental deviations.

The character Amvrosov suffered from a large painful swelling under the skin. Both translations choose the direct equivalent to the original: “a carbuncle.” This lexical unit is a representative of medical sphere, but it is a characteristic feature of the core of the semantic field lexical units, denoting physiological diseases of the physiological component of the category of deviation.

The novelist Ieronym Poprikhin wanted to send his wife to Perelygino to treat goiter. R. Pevear and L. Volokhonsky include the term “goitre” into the narration. It is a medical term. Thus, this lexical unit represents the core of the semantic field medical terms, denoting deviations in physiology. M. Glenny substitutes this diagnosis by the general collocation “my sick wife.” In the context of this example, the lexeme “sick” refers to the core of the semantic field lexical units, denoting physiological diseases of the physiological component of the category of deviation. It is also revealed in the boundaries of the semantic field lexical units, denoting mental deviations of the mental component of the category of deviation.

After his meeting with Mr. Woland, who forecast the death of Berlioz, Ivan Nikolayich found himself in the asylum because of running along the streets, shouting that the intelligence agent had arrived in Moscow. Three people in white asked him the questions about the diseases he had in his childhood: “Thus, they got out of Ivan decidedly everything about his past life, down to when and how he had fallen ill with scarlet fever fifteen years ago” (Pevear & Volokhonsky, 1997); “They carefully extracted from Ivan everything about his past life, down to an attack of scarlet fever fifteen years before” (Glenny, 1967).

The translation by R. Pevear and L. Volokhonsky includes the phraseological unit “to fall ill” with the collocation “scarlet fever,” derived from the medical sphere. Mr. Glenny removes the predicate and leaves the collocation “attack of scarlet fever.” The collocation “scarlet fever” and the lexeme attack characterize the semantic fields of medical terms, denoting deviations in physiology, and lexical units, denoting physiological diseases. The collocation “to fall ill with” in this context actualizes the meaning within the semantic field of lexical units, denoting physiological diseases.

Mikhail Alexandrovich’s assistant in Massolit and the writer Zheldybin accompanied a professor of forensic medicine in the morgue to see the body of Berlioz after the accident with the tram: “On the first lay the naked body, covered with dry blood, one arm broken, the chest caved in; on the second, the head with the front teeth knocked out . . .” (Pevear & Volokhonsky, 1997). “On the first lay the naked, blood-caked body with a fractured arm and smashed rib-cage, on the second the head, its front teeth knocked in . . .” (Glenny, 1967).

Berlioz got his traumas when crossing the street. He slipped and was run over by the tram. The collocations “naked body, covered with dry blood,” “one arm broken,” “the chest caved in,” and “the head with the front teeth knocked out” within the context refer to the semantic field of lexical units, denoting traumas of the physiological component of the category of deviation in the translation by R. Pevear and L. Volokhonsky. They actualize their direct meanings: “damaged arm,” “to fallen inward,” “to cause to stop working” in the core of the above-mentioned semantic field and belong to neutral-bookish style. The collocation “dry blood” also expresses the meaning of plasma and belongs to the core of the semantic field of medical terms denoting no deviations.

Glenny’s translation includes the collocation “blood-caked body.” The lexeme “blood-caked” represents both the semantic fields of medical terms, denoting deviations in physiology, and lexical units, denoting traumas. Glenny uses another medical collocation “fractured arm” to actualize the meaning “to be damaged in a sudden or violent way.” The author prefers the lexeme “smashed” in the collocation “smashed rib-cage.” It represents the meaning “broken to pieces” in comparison with the meaning of “fallen inward” by R. Pevear and L. Volokhonsky. The collocation “rib cage” belongs to the sphere of medical terms with the meaning “the curved wall of ribs.” The phraseological unit “knocked in,” given in neutral-bookish style, actualizes the meaning “be struck in a particular part of a body.” This lexical unit can also represent the meanings of slang origin and show the linguistic peculiarities of semantic fields of other categories.

The revealed meanings of lexical units within the context of The Master and Margarita are the contents of the semantic fields of the category of deviation. They refer to the concepts, denoting mental or physiological aberrations. The contextual environment of the work helps to define the semantics of the above-mentioned lexemes concretely.

**Conclusion**

The semantic category of deviation presupposes its special structure with the core and peripheries in the boundaries of the literary work The Master and Margarita. The author revealed peculiar features of such structure under the support of conceptual analysis including the contextual method.

The focus of such method is the meanings the lexical units actualize within lexical entries and meanings considered in the boundaries of the above-mentioned text. The means of expressing the semantic fields of the category of deviation are its contents, but they can also be a part of the categories of higher abstraction in other texts. The author’s opinion about the category of deviation is that it can also exist in the form of illustrations presented in the translations. In general, they are not the main part of the category expression, but one of its essential parts. The category of deviation, as most of the categories, is verbalized.
The semantic fields of mental and physiological components of the category of deviation have different structures in the above-mentioned translations. This analysis detects the similarities only in the choice of lexical units: In most of the cases, the authors prefer to use the lexemes and collocations from the same semantic level.

These lexical units are the means of expressing the concept of high abstraction, the category of deviation, which implies various components. The differences of mental and physiological components of the category of deviation, revealed in the section “discussion,” define the boundaries of semantic fields and their intersections in the world-images of scholars M. Glenny, R. Pevear, and L. Volokhonsky.

Limitation and Study Forward
The category of deviation is not a stable structure; it can include the elements that characterize personal experience, worldview, and cultural phenomena. The background of authors under study demonstrates the presence of word or senescence structures that actualize special meanings, reflecting translators’ knowledge of other cultures and their worldview in a certain historical period. Despite good understanding of another culture, the translators face the problems with the description of national specific features of the language. This process should imply revealing culturally specific semantic components only in the target language.

Various theories of functional grammar and cognitive linguistics can interpret the structure of the category of deviation in a different way. The choice of the method of reconstructing a chosen category depends on the approach, strategies implied by a certain scholar.

The author of this article supposes further analysis of euphemisms in the book The Master and Margarita by Mikhail Bulgakov. It also sounds promising to study it in the sense of contrastive linguistics revealing lacunas in two languages, full and partial equivalents of the source language and both translations mentioned in this article.
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