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Abstract. This article aims to provide an overview of the current state of literary translation in Ukraine (basically from English into Ukrainian) focusing on the periods to signify its flourishing, touching upon the patterns of dissemination and reception, identifying areas of further research as well as highlighting key matters of enquiry. For the purposes of this report, the frame of reference has to be attributed to the 1960s as the site of global extension and major explosion in Ukrainian translations that had for long lagged behind and existed under the dominance of Russian translation school. The research work intends to give a broad outline of contemporary views on the Ukrainian translation heritage of the aforementioned period accentuating on the works of Rostislav Dotsenko, Dmytro Palamarchuk and Yury Lisnyak. It has conclusively been proved that they proclaimed new insights into translation methodology with particular emphasis on the style and accuracy of the translated versions, their intended audience, social value as well as their relation to literary trends in English. The use of comparative method moves to consider the translators’ techniques not only in terms of differences between languages but also from the perspective of how these translations have been perceived or assessed.
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Introduction

Once perceived as a marginal activity based on binary oppositions between languages, literary translation is sought to explore much broader questions of power relations and develop more critical awareness of its cultural and ideological implications. This phenomenon being inextricably linked with the reception and reader-response started to be recognized as a fundamental act of continual exchange of knowledge, opening horizons beyond the national boundaries as well as raising the issues of nation’s cultural prestige. Thus, the emphasis is placed on the role of translations in the creation and maintenance of national and world literatures, the translator’s objectives and the designated reader, rather than on any notions of differences between languages.

The critical and theoretical assessment of translation in this context opens a wide range of perspectives to investigate it from the standpoint of Comparative Literature. With its interest of crossing the borders between languages, cultures and national literatures, the discipline is implicitly committed to performing the function and value of translation in the widest sense of the term.

Being in the genesis of comparative studies translations have been studied and identified as a communication vehicle to highlight the relations between various literary works and how they have contributed to a literary and cultural build-up. As David Damrosch (Harvard University) would put it, ”where literature exists, translation exists. The very notion of literature would be inconceivable without translation”. Thus, the entire history of world literature is determined by certain processes of transmission, i.e. works of literature are fully recognized and enrich themselves by generating new meanings. Translation could be seen in this perspective as” the secret metaphor of all literary communication” (Damrosch, 2011).

Results

This paper aims to provide an overview of the current state of literary translation in Ukraine (basically from English into Ukrainian) focusing on the periods to signify its flourishing, touching upon the patterns of dissemination and reception, identifying areas of further research as well as highlighting key matters of enquiry.

For the purposes of this report, the frame of reference has to be attributed to the 1960s as the site of global extension and major explosion in Ukrainian translations. On the whole, the 1960s are considered to be the crucial period in political and cultural life of Ukraine. Hence, its representatives were defined as “shistdesiatnyky”, the new generation of writers formed in the period of temporal “Khrushchov’s thaw” (1954-1964). The movement was characterised by “evident contradictory thesaurus of narratives”. On the one
hand it was the period of hopeful expectations for democratic revival, freedoms and cultural development, and on the other hand, the 1960s proved to be the decade of harsh disillusionments, severe suppression of artists, writers, translators and filmmakers for their anti-Soviet propaganda and rejuvenation of avant-garde motives in their works. The new generation of writers commonly known as writers of the 1960s, is represented by Lina Kostenko, Vasil Symonenko, Ivan Drach, Mykola Vingranovsky, Vasyl Goloborodko, Ihor Kalinets, Ivan Sokulsky, etc. (poetry), Valery Shevchuck, Hrygir Tyutyunnyk, Volodymyr Drozd, Yevgen Gutsalo (prose), Ivan Dzyuba, Yevgen Sverstyuk, Ivan Boichack, Ivan Chamber (criticism). They renewed the traditions of Sokulsky, etc. (poetry), Valery Shevchuck, Hrygir Tyutyunnyk, Volodymyr Drozd, Yevgen Gutsalo (prose), Kostenko, Vasil Symonenko, Ivan Drach, Mykola Vingranovsky, Vasyl Goloborodko, Ihor Kalinets, Ivan Sokulsky, etc. (poetry), Valery Shevchuck, Hrygir Tyutyunnyk, Volodymyr Drozd, Yevgen Gutsalo (prose), Ivan Dzyuba, Yevgen Sverstyuk, Ivan Boichack, Ivan Chamber (criticism). They renewed the traditions of classic pre-revolution intelligentsia aspiring to spiritual independence, social and political estrangement, morality, aesthetic ideals of civil society. The artistic works of these masters of the pen aimed to reconsider existing literary norms and demonstrated a stronger and broader effect for bringing certain renovations, updating artistic forms and introducing innovative artistic methodology in literature marked by romantic humanism, neopopulist tendencies, insights into human nature, realistic image of reality released from social realism dogmas and formalism.

Their philosophical musings and debates had a great impact on the revival of Ukrainian “translation scene” that had for long lagged behind and existed under the dominance of Russian translation school. Therefore, the new generation of Ukrainian translators represented by talented and patriotically minded intelligentsia considered themselves responsible for preserving a distinct identity as the only way to get rid of this domination and lessen the pressure of measuring up to its ideals. Among those who introduced radically new insights to translation by putting forward a categorical demand to get rid of literarism and improve the artistic level of translation were Mykola Lukash, Hrygor Kochur, Anatol Perapadya, Rostislav Dotsenko, Oleksander Terekh, Yury Lisnyak, Dmytro Palamarchuk, Andriy Sodomora (b. 1937) and others.

Many of them graduated from philological faculties of Universities in Ukraine and were imprisoned for their political motives (for not being faithful adherents of the Soviet regime). The years spent in the concentration camps opened them an opportunity to get involved in the process of learning foreign languages and start their translation activity.

Even when they were set free, they were under a thorough supervision of the KGB. Hence, the information uncovered in “Secret” (the data declassified and released by Central Intelligence Agency Sources Methods Exemption 3828, Nazi War Crimes Disclosure Act, dated 2007) lies in the following: “the poetry and prose written by this group is very modern in form, as well as, to some extent, in its subject matter.” Official Soviet critics characterise it as “conspicuous of a thirst for seeking new ways, new forms, new topics and new words”. The document also testifies their striving for greater freedom of expression and establishing cultural ties with the Western World, though “they criticise America and the Western world for the lack of initiative toward their treatment of, the nationality problem of the USSR and, more widely, regarding coexistence with the past and present Soviet regime or government of the USSR, for the lack of support of Hungarian Revolution, the liquidation of which severed the internal struggle and demands for further relaxations. They also criticise the capitalist system as they understand it from official Soviet propaganda” (USA, 2007). Hereinafter the information is described with the reference to the dissatisfaction or opposition they reveal in hidden form against the present regime: “We must accept the fact that among today’s youth this movement is much deeper and more important than the young writers reveal mainly because they try to write not to give cause for them to be accused of deviation from communist principles, the spirit of Leninism, etc.”

The facts provided in these records confirm the increase in individual and group contacts initiated by the West, mailing of books, press, brochures in more intensified form than in the past and by other new means, the use of radio and television to increase the transmission of information and commentaries on the events in the USSR, as well as the transmittal of a series of lectures on history, culture, language, the liquidation of colonialism in the world, the cooperation and friendship between people, nations, etc.

In particular, as it is implied in the records “Secret”, these contacts are to be realised via publications, the preparation and transmittal of collections of works by Ukrainian émigré writers and translations of poetry of a pure literary character, meetings and gatherings in New York, Western Europe and Ukraine for the purpose of exchanging ideas and views, an endeavour to obtain from young writers in the Ukraine their works for publication in the West in Ukrainian and other languages. At the same time, the paper notes that “the KGB will not agree to such contacts to be held in New York or Europe, but such a refusal will also prove useful to us. We can also doubt that the party leaders will agree to having the works of émigré writers published in the Soviet press, but this also will be proof that not we, but they, forbid free speech even in pure cultural or
publishes translations from contemporary foreign literature. It featured works of 51 winners of Nobel prize in psychological and political (in all 4000 works of fiction that represent 98 literatures of the world, more than

Noteworthy in this regard was ‘Vsesvit’ a literary monthly journal, fully dedicated to foreign literature and culture. On the one hand, publishing houses, being politically motivated institutions, that provided censorship or promoted certain works, often dictated the translation method. Editors and publishers made all necessary selection, as well as sales teams and reviewers whose comments indicated how translations were received in the target culture. Despite the conditions of total censorship and new series of arrests, the chief editor Dmytro Pavlichko provided the basis conductive to the atmosphere of creative freedom and cooperative relationship. The journal proved to be a single source of information in Ukraine about world literature and culture, the centre of translation studies; it reared a new generation of translators and literary critics and contributed greatly to the cultural relations of Ukraine with the world. For years it publishes numerous examples with different kinds of narratives–novels and short stories, realistic and fantastic, lyrical and philosophical, psychological and political (in all 4000 works of fiction that represent 98 literatures of the world, more than 120000 articles, essays, interviews, etc.). Alongside with the translation of the world classics Vsesvit publishes translations from contemporary foreign literature. It featured works of 51 winners of Nobel prize in literature, a great number of both world famous and promising young authors in translation from 81 languages of the world. Ukrainian readers would have an opportunity to get acquainted with practically all European, Asian and Latin-American literature (including the ones less known in Ukraine – Gaelic, Catalan, Sorbian, Provencal, Rhaeto-Romance, Frisian). On the whole literary works of contemporary writers from 52 countries of different continents, that had never been published in Ukrainian translations before or existed in their abridged versions were at the readers’ disposal. Taking into consideration that the access to all Vsesvit’s publications was difficult (its yearly filings for the 20-70-ies are the objects of rarity) and the guide-book for all the 864 issues published from 1925 till 2000 is still lacking, a systematic directory of the journal’s publications during the aforementioned period was compiled.

Among the translators who contributed greatly to the world recognition of the journal were O.Mokrovolsky (b.1946), V.Shovkun (b.1940), M.Pinchevsky, Yu.Lisnyak, A.Perepadya, Y.Popovich, O.Senyuk(b.1929), M.Lytvynets, H.Philipchuk (b.1936), D.Palamarchuk, R.Dotsenko and others. Their translated versions were undeniably a real breakthrough that marked a rebirth of Ukrainian translations as well as opened the possibility for their worldwide recognition.

Whilst it appears impossible to comprehensively represent the entire community of Ukrainian translators who belong to the movement of the 1960s, our choice of respondents is determined by lack of information about them though their translations of English and American works of fiction continue to engage and inspire readers all over the world. Yet, we cannot get neglected by the high level of artistic translations from several foreign languages (both in prose and poetry) made by M.Lukash and H.Kochur, “the two most outstanding opponents of Russification of the Ukrainian people”, a “symbol of persistence and unyielding defence of the right of the Ukrainian language and culture to their free and independent development and functioning” (Korunets, 2003).

They never yield to the pressure and intimidation of the Soviet censorship that accused the translators of the “extraordinary archaization of the Ukrainian language and other cardinal sins “The breadth of views and experience, and the insight these “messengers of culture” offered proved to be the guidelines for a new linguistic generation of Ukrainian translators of the period mentioned.

The dominance of fluency in verse and prose translations from English into Ukrainian becomes apparent due to the Translator’s section in the Ukrainian Writers Union in the early and mid sixties. An inspirational role in this process undoubtedly belonged to Kochur who greatly influenced and guided the Ukrainian translators during his chairmanship in the section. Despite a new wave of political persecutions and reprisals,
his ideological and spiritual adherents R.Dotsenko, Yu.Lisnyak, D.Palamarchuk and other talented men of pen demonstrated their eagerness to uphold the fundamental values of the Ukrainian language in the world literary space.

For this reason they proclaimed new insights in the translation methodology that focused on the style and accuracy of the translated versions, their intended audience, social value as well as their relation to literary trends in English. They are compelled to advance their interest to make the translations directly from the original and objected to the ones produced on the basis of interlinear translations that used to come out from publishing houses. Being employed in ‘Veselka’, ‘Dnipro’ as translators or members of editorial board at different times R.Dotsenko, Yu.Lisnyak, D.Palamarchuk together with other progressive translators perfectly realized that basic principles of high quality artistic translation must be addressed from a common perspective. Their revised project has the following major thrusts:

- to maintain all the structural peculiarities of the original in the target language version;
- to stay true to the author’s conception;
- to maintain the fidelity in the means of the author’s depicting the artistic images and figurativeness pertained to the language of the original;
- to mirror peculiar features (lexical, syntactic and stylistic means of expression) of the original;
- to avoid deliberate omissions, shortenings, enlargements or any other manifestations of freewheeling translation with an authority of “plain styles”.

The latter in English-language writing was achieved over centuries, what Bernstein (1986) as cited by Venuti (2000) describes as “the historical movement toward uniform spelling and grammar, with an ideology that emphasises nonidiosyncratic, smooth translation, elimination of awkwardness, etc. – anything that might concentrate attention on the language itself”. In contemporary Anglo-American literature, this movement has made realism the most prevalent form of narrative and free, prose-like verse the most prevalent form of poetry. For comparing values the author comments on Sterne’s work, where the look and texture—the opacity—of the text is everywhere present, a neutral transparent prose style has developed in certain novels where the words seem meant to be looked through – to the depicted world beyond the page. Likewise, in current middle of the road poetry, we see the elimination of overt rhyme and alliteration, with the metric forms retained primarily for their capacity to officialise as “poetry” (Venuti, 2000).

In view of the trends listed above, it seems inevitable to accentuate on the transparency that would become an authoritative discourse for translating, no matter whether a foreign text was a poetry or fiction. The dominance of transparency in English-language translation is closely connected with the phenomenon of “translator’s invisibility” (Venuti, 2000) that is partly determined by the individualistic conception of authorship that continues to prevail in Anglo-American culture. According to this conception, as Venuti (2000) would put it, “the author freely expresses his thoughts and feelings in writing, which is thus viewed as an original and transparent self-representation, unmediated transindividual determinants (linguistic, cultural, social) that might complicate authorial originality. This view of authorship carries two disadvantageous implications for the translator. On the one hand, translation is understood as a second-order representation: only the foreign text can be original, an authentic copy, true to the author’s personality or intention, whereas the translation is derivative, fake, potentially a false copy. On the one hand, translation is required to efface its second-order status with transparent discourse, producing the illusion of authorial presence whereby the translated text can be taken as the original” (Venuti, 2000). Proceeding from these, the author concludes, that however much the individualistic conception of authorship devalues translation, it shapes translators’ self-presentation, leading some to psychologise their relationship to the foreign text as a process of identification with the author.

The aforesaid holds for R. Dotsenko (1931-2012), a contemporary Ukrainian translator and literary critic, culturist, author of aphorisms and sentencias, member of National Union of Writers, laureate of awards named after Rylskyi and Lukash. His name stands out from the other translators profiled here in a number of ways: one could hardly name anyone who produced such a great variety of prose works from literature of the English-speaking world (Oscar Wilde, Mark Twain, Fennimore Cooper, William Faulkner, Edgar Alan Poe, Charles Dickens, Margaret Mitchell, Arthur Conan Doyle, Lewis Stevenson, Jonathan Swift, Brian Fry, Ray Bradbury, Frank O’Connor, James Joyce, Evan Hunter) as well as works from French, Polish and other literatures. He was an active participant of the Sixties Movement in Ukraine, a former political prisoner (twice arrested on charges of “Anti-Soviet activism and propaganda”, “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism”). During
the years of imprisonment he got acquainted with the key figures of Ukrainian national liberation movement – Patriarch Joseph Slipyj, UPA veterans, heroes of the Lithuanian resistance movement, as well as artists, scientists, philosophers. As R. Dotsenko would put it: “From Mordovia camps, unexpectedly I joined the Kiev Sixties (name of the a new generation of Soviet and Ukrainian national intelligentsia that entered the culture, art, literature, and politics in the Soviet Union in the second half of 1950) where I got acquainted with Ivan Svitlychny, Ivan Dziuba, Lina Kostenko, Alla Horska and many, many other outstanding personalities of those revival years”. These contacts of his made him always be under the control of the KGB. In the early 1970s, the “Dnipro” publishing house gathered a group of writers guided by Ivan Dziuba, who worked with Mykola Lukash and Hryhoriy Kochur, and Dotsenko was threatened with a new arrest. After refusing to cooperate with the KGB he was dismissed from work in “Dnipro” and his translations were forbidden. But despite all these, he stayed true to his ideals and had the fortitude to bear and overcome all the difficulties. He stepped back in shade, in “internal emigration”, proceeding with translations, working in a village library with almost no pay. In the 1980s when the so called “perestroika” started Dotsenko promoted the publication of works by Leonid Hrebinka as well as popularized works by O. Teliha, O. Kurinnyi, O. Hryhorenko, A. Jaworowskiy, H. Mazurenko, P. Karpenko-Krynysyta, A. Tarnawskyi, L. Lyman in periodicals, in particular, in a “Universe” he made a serious review of Martha Tarnawska’s annotated bibliography of Ukrainian literature in English. In this context she noted: “Rostyslav Dotsenko was my first literary contact and critic in Ukraine, he consulted me on different publishing businesses, and I really appreciated his advice and critical attention” (Tarnawska, 1996).

It is hard to distinguish his most successful work, which instantly earned him the reputation as a translator. He emerged on the scene not only via translations but via other projects connected with his literary activities. Rostislav Dotsenko describes his interest in literary translation springing from an academic interest, especially the forms and processes of integral cultural development. His theoretical assumptions to translation problems reflect in some ways the issues of equivalency and transparency. R. Dotsenko fully realized that time was ripe for new insights in translation, but at the same time he didn’t at all deny the utility of Gentzler’s views on the problem in question: “translation theory has not only to work for better mutual comprehension between users of diverse tongues; more central still in its purposing is a more complete viewing of itself and of the comprehending which it should serve” (Gentzler, 2001). R. Dotsenko was clearly fascinated by the notion that translations are considered to be successful when they are read “fluently”, with the appearance of not being translated. Yet, he drew a clear distinction between authoring and translating, and his critical reception of the problem gives him an opportunity to consider himself in a kind of collaboration with the author. R. Dotsenko always tried to stay faithful to the basic text in such a way that his own personality was “in shadowy existence. As he would put it: any sense of authorial presence in translation is an effect of transparent discourse”, and his translations were based on the inner creative interaction with the author of the original. Such was his approach to William Faulkner’s translations whose inciting works and artistic models still continue to challenge various misconceptions marked by heated debates and rebuttals, along with radically coloured reappraisals. Dotsenko’s critical reception of Faulkner’s works contributed to their international relevance and worldwide impact.

Faulkner’s writing style known to be marked by complex sentence structure that seems to persist in mannerisms and establishes a hierarchy of meaning has always been a subject for numerous debates in terms of splitting them into shorter segments while translating the writer’s works into a foreign language. R. Dotsenko is governed by his own thoughts, feelings and ideas to provide the highest quality translation due to the excellent idiomatic command of English as well as cultural knowledge. He aims to understand the “spirit” of the original as well as the entire system of the author’s views and sentiments represented in it. The main character’s grandad announces a piece of wisdom that is the author’s moral credo which coincides with Dotsenko’s aesthetic views: “Порядна людина ніколи не забуває свого минулого. Вона дивиться життю просто в вічні. Порядна людина завжди відповідає за свої вчинки і бере на себе тягар їх наслідків, навіть коли вона не викликала цих вчинків, а тільки мовчки прислала на них і не сказала “ні”, хоч і знала, що повинна була так” (Dotsenko, 2013).

R. Dotsenko has always tried to carefully avoid every fault with which other translators were often too justly charged. Linked to the statement that losses in translation prove to be a reflection of the difficulty of finding the right word which lies at the heart of any speech or writing act, he made all possible assumptions to fill all these lacunae. Unlike other translators who dismiss translation theory as useless abstraction,
R. Dotsenko moves to consider his own register about it. According to him not every translator must be interested in theory, but a clear awareness of theoretical concepts and phenomena surrounding cultural exchange should be quite important especially for novice translators. Not only he considered theory to have a clear value in translator’s own technique, but also in terms of how literary translation is perceived or assessed. This awareness helped the translator to produce high quality versions which at first sight seem untranslatable. Dotsenko’s translations wake senses which readers may never have seen or explore. He “lets them experience the beauty and touch of foreign lands, lets them smell the smells, feel the breeze, and hear the rustle of foreign trees” (Zgadzaj and Roberts, 2013).

Dmytro Palamarchuk (1914-1998), a poet and a prolific Ukrainian translator of the 1960s, gained his world wide recognition due to successful versification of all 154 sonnets of Shakespeare (1966). Two years later the Ukrainian version of the sonnets was shared to Stratford-on-Avon, Shakespeare’s birthplace. Expressing his appreciation for the valuable contribution the Ukrainian translator made to provide the greatest English poet’s widest possible dissemination, the director of Shakespeare’s Centre noted that “Ukrainian translation will hold a peculiar place among the collection of foreign translations available in the Centre”. It was Dmitro Palamarchuk who created a new page in “Ukrainian Shakespearean”. The sonnets have once been freely voiced in Ukrainian, beyond the borders of English-speaking world with those huge potentials hidden in the depths of their core matters. D. Palamarchuk made a brilliant translation of Shakespeare’s two sonnets that for long seemed to be untranslatable.

Thus, the shift of bawdy connotations of the word “will” in the original has been successfully reflected in the translation. His Ukrainian version gives the readers a possibility to reveal the hidden relevant meanings, thus accentuating that not all of them are bawdy. In fact the obvious identification of “will” as ‘violation, desire, intent’ is often suppressed entirely, and a straightforward reading of the poem with no dominant attention to all the bawdy puns, tends to produce a wrong effect on the reader:

**CXXXV**

*Whoever hath her wish, thou hast thy Will,*  
*And Will to boot, and Will in over-plus;*  
*More than enough am I that vexed thee still,*  
*To thy sweet will making addition thus.*

*Wilt thou, whose will is large and spacious,*  
*Not once vouchsafe to hide my will in thine?*  
*Shall will in others seem right gracious,*  
*And in my will no fair acceptance shine?*  
*The sea, all water, yet receives rain still,*  
*And in abundance addeth to his store;*  
*So thou, being rich in Will, add to thy Will*  
*One will of mine, to make thy large will more.*  
*Let no unkind, no fair beseechers kill;*  
*Think all but one, and me in that one Will.*

It can be obviously seen that all puns of the original have been presented in a masterly and exceedingly varied fashion in translation:

*Авжеж, воліти волі всі ми вільні, –*  
*То ж Вілля мати серця не гріх,*  
*Нехай же буде вічно тільки Вільне в нім*  
*Додачею до всіх волінь твоїх.*  
*Не вволиш волі – хай волає Віль?*  
*Чи, може, іншим серця ті вділила*  
*І вільно Вільну втиснути відтіль?*  
*Безмежне море до свого привілля*  
*Приймай дощі в солоне лоно хвиль.*  
*Тож будь і ти привільніша до Вілля*  
*І власну волю увелич на “Вілль”.*  
*Не відмовляй мені і серцем свійм*  
*Вічній усі свої воління Вілем*!
Yet, it should be emphasised that the sonnet is not entirely flattering to the woman addressed, and whether she was ever shown here directly. The two sonnets are written from a male perspective depicting women imperfect and deficient in understanding global issues:

**CXXXVI**

If thy soul check thee that I come so near,
Swear to thy blind soul that I was thy Will,
And will, thy soul knows, is admitted there;
Thus far for love, my love-suit, sweet, fulfil.

Will, will fulfil the treasure of thy love,
Ay, fill it full with wills, and my will one.
In things of great receipt with ease we prove
Among a number one is reckoned none:
Then in the number let me pass untold,
Though in thy store's account I one must be;
For nothing hold me, so it please thee hold
That nothing me, a something sweet to thee:
Make but my name thy love, and love that still,
And then thou lovest me for my name is "Will."

As seen this sonnet not only represents the play on the word “Will” as it is observed in the previous one, but extends it further into various puns on “something” and “nothing”. The translation as well as the original refers to an uncertainty of how many Williams are implied, and whether they are lovers, friends, or whether the author himself is intended:

Як видався я душі твоїй немилим,
Заприсягни нечулій і сліпій.
Що звусь я Волею, Волінням, Вілем,
То й маю залишитися при ній,
Доповнивши твоє чуття скарбницю,
В числі водінь твоїх хай буде й Віль.
Не важить там нічого одиниця,
Де множество зійшлося звідусіль.
Хай буде в велелюднім тлумі тому
Віль, мов кукіль серед поживних зіль,
Аби в очах лишень і в серці твому
Щось важив той малопримітний Віль.
Люби лиш волю — й перед світом цілим
Мене любитимеш, бо звусь я Вілем.

Among other most relevant aspects of D.Palamarchuk’s literary heritage were the translations of a collection of Byron’s and Shelley’s poems as well as several novels by H.Wells, A.France, A.Stendhal, H.Flauer. He successfully versified poems of well-known French authors (C.Baudelaire, S.Pru’d’honne, J.Heredia, S.Malarme, A.Renoir, outstanding Polish (A.Mickiewicz, Yu.Tuwim), German (H. Heine), Italian (E.Petrarka) and Byelorussian (M.Tank, P.Hiebka) poets.

Yuiry Lisnyak (1929-1992), who also represented the Sixties Movement, is known to the Ukrainian reader as the author of prose and poetry translation from several foreign languages: English (Ch.Dickens, R.Aldington, B.Golding, H.Melville, E.Poe, J.Swift, J.Jerome,W.Shakespeare), German (H.Nahbar, B.Brecht, H.Mann, etc.), French (A.France, de Balzac),Czech ( .Jrasek) and other foreign authors. He skillfully combined translations with editorial activity. Thus, he was the chief editor of the new complete six-volume edition (1984-1986) of hakespeare’s works in Ukrainian translations made by M.Ryl’sky, O.Mokrovol’sky, I.Steshenko, B.Ten, H.Kochur, D.Palamarchuk, V.Koptilov and some others. Yu.Lisnyak was the one to propose a fresh treatment in Ukrainian ‘Dickensian’. The fact that he has chosen “Hard Times” for translation was not accidental: the option has been associated with translator’s e growing awareness that the writer’s sharp criticism of the industrial England with all its inadequacies and injustices seemed thought-provoking and relevant to Ukrainian society of the current period. The author’s denunciation of a capitalist system that weakens the social fabric turned out to be akin to his moral standards. Thus, in his translation of Charles
Dickens’ novel Yu.Lisnyak masterly reflected the author’s intentions aimed to challenge the prevailing view of the society where facts and practical values held higher positions than human feelings. He also succeeded in reproducing the peculiarities of the author’s style that is known to be marked by “profuse linguistic creativity” (Kovaliv, 2007).

In the late 1940s some of Dickens’ novels as well as “Hard times” were not considered serious fiction and were not part of the English literary canon. Though F. R. Leavis saw Dickens as a great entertainer, he did not regard the novelist fit to be included in “the Great Tradition” of the English novel due to the fact that Dickens lacked seriousness something that Henry James and Joseph Conrad possessed (Leavis, 1966). However Leavis made an exception with Dickens’ novel “Hard Times”. He admitted that the novel had complete seriousness that could excite the adult mind and praised the novel’s tight story, clear symbolism, moral values, sharp dialogue, natural style and convincing denouement. According to him “Hard Times” was as a great moral fable that captured the writer’s moral vision.

The translations of Charles Dickens’ novels previously made in Russian before 1960s (Gustav Shpett, Arkady Gornfield, Alexanna Krivtsova, Yevheny Lann), distinguished themselves by excessive literalism and, according to Nora Gal, a literary critic, these translations “were stern, stiff, formalistic and unreadable”. The same holds true for the Ukrainian version made by Konstantin Shmigosky. Yu.Lisnyak, as mentioned above, introduced a new insight in Dickens’ Ukrainian interpretations. His description of characters were made in ways which reinforce each other, so that reader’s certain feelings and emotions are built up and renewed, whereas in Shmigosky’s translation these proper names, rendered by means of transcription, display “zero stylistic position” and zero effect on the reader: "Грецкий" - "Gradgrind", "Мен-Чокеама́лд" - "M’Choakumchild", "Баундербі" - "Bounderby", "Блекпул" - "Blackpool", "Мерильс" - "Merrylegs", "Коктаун" - "Coke town" etc. As the examples show, these names neither reveal the inner world of the main characters nor identify their origin which attests to the fact that the author’s intentions are overshadowed and the name “is no longer articulating”. In contrast with these, Yu.Lisnyak had a focused ability to concentrate on the minutiae, picking out details in all their possible shades. One might argue that he managed not only to “individualise” main characters’ speech but, also to give a clear and accurate account of their names, saving semantics and word-building models typical of the original text, and in his translation Dickens’ keen sense of language is rendered with precision.

Thus, the writer depicts Thomas Gradgrind, a wealthy, retired merchant in the industrial city of Coketown, England, who dedicated his life to a philosophy of rationalism, self-interest, and fact. He raised his children, according to this philosophy and never allowed them to engage in fanciful or imaginative pursuits.


Another promising translator’s finding is the name of Josiah Bounderby that features transparent semantics as well (“bounder – a disagreeing word for a man who has behaved in a way that you think is morally wrong”). Mr. Bounderby is described as a machine of the nineteenth century, a “bully of humility” and “inflated like a balloon”. He was a “banker, merchant, manufacturer” and could have a “spiritual relationship” with anyone “perfectly devoid of sentiment”. He had a “metallic laugh” like a machine and was made of some “course material”, with “swelled veins”, “puffed head”, and “strained skin”. By his own statement he was “born in a ditch” and arose to great heights by dint of merit and hard work—one “a self-made man”. Yu.Lisnyak carried out a thoroughgoing review of the main character’s inner world and found a Ukrainian equivalent “Горлодербі” that fully reflects it (Ukr.”дерти горло” – “to speak at the top of one’s voice”). The second part of the word “дербі” equals the English word “derby”. “All the way to Stone Lodge, as with grave indignation he led the two delinquents home, he repeated at intervals "What would Mr. Bounderby say?" – as if Mr. Bounderby had been Mrs. Grundy” (Dickens, 1994). – “І далі, всю дорогу до Кам’яної Осади, ведучи провинників додому, він час від часу проказував суворо й гнівно: — Що скаже, пан Горлодербі? — так, наче пан Горлодербі був не пан Горлодербі, а пан Гранді” (Dickens, 1970).

The author introduces M’Choakumchild who was fresh from a training college, as a symbol of a new school ideology that didn’t seem to be in accord with his moral visions. Instead of developing students’ abilities and teaching them to think, he adheres to the methodology that is based on making them memorize dry scientific facts. Dickens’ satire, observed in the choice of the name as well as depicting the character,
reveals the author’s intention to criticise teachers ‘training schools of that time. The “ten chilled fingers” of M’Choakumchild and his “stony way” stifle the imaginative “fancy” that is “lurking within” each child. All these “shades” are displayed in Yu.Lisnyak’s translation: “Пан Дітодавс” – “М’Choakumchild”. The first part of the name “Choak” is an English omophone of “choke” – “to stifle”, “oppress” – “душити” (Ukr.); the second part “child” – “дитина”. M’Choakumchild, and some one hundred and forty other schoolmasters, had been lately turned at the same time, in the same factory, on the same principles, like so many pianoforte legs” (Dickens, 1994) – “Пана Дітодавса самого її ще з півтораста шкільних учителів тільки нещодавно виготовили однією партією, за одним зразком, на тій самій фабриці, ніби сто сорок ніжок до фортепіано” (Dickens, 1970).

Another evidence of Yu.Lisnyak’s translation skills was the way he represents Stephen Blackpool, a poor factory worker who was keenly feeling the injustice of the law system and could no longer stand it, though unable to change the situation. The translator goes deep into the name semantics again and found a corresponding analogue to the English anthroponym Blackpool (“black”+ “pool”) – “Бездол” (Ukr. “без” – “without,” “доля” – “fortune”).

The novel contains a large number of other cases that testify to the usage of stylistically coloured names. Sissi’s dog, for instance, is called “Merrylegs”. The fact that Sissi’s father was a circus performer and, the dog was often seen playing in his show, the translator searching for suitable words relevant to the original, decided on “Танцюй” (“dance”).

Coketown in the novel symbolizes the negative effects of industrialization on English towns in the period mentioned. The growing number of factories as a result of industrial revolution in England, led to pollution, social imbalance and individual confusion. The soot-coated, black and savage Coketown are associated with repetitiveness, routine, dreariness, monotony and drudgery. Both its streets and the residents have lost their unique images and were too much alike. The repeated use of the word “same” and the phrase “like one another” highlight both the monotony of Coketown and the drudgery of the people who live there: Everything in the redbrick Coketown is “severely workful” and the idea of sameness extends to the eighteen churches of different “religious persuasions,” the jail, infirmary, town hall, school and cemetery”.

The toponym “Coketown” is translated as “Коктаун” (“coke” – “чорна смола”); “town” –Ukr. “місто” (centre of population that is larger than a village but smaller than a city).

Another example of the toponym being faithfully reproduced in the translation is Gradgrind’s “matter-of-fact” home in Coketown aptly called “Stone Lodge” (Dickens, 1994) – (“stone” – (Ukr.) “камінь”, “lodge” – “приміщення”, “оселя”). The house reflects practical personality of its owner and all possible values of utilitarianism: It was “square” with a “heavy portico” which darkened “the principal windows, as its master’s heavy brows [overshadowing] his eyes” The house is quite geometrical and made of “iron, clamps and girders” with a lawn out of a “botanical account-book”. The house even had “mechanical lifts for the housemaids” and all kinds of cabinets—metallurgical cabinets, conchological cabinets for the children. Stone Lodge is “haunted by the ghost of damp mortar” (Dickens, 1994).

There are a lot of other examples to illustrate that as a translator, Yu. Lisnyak’s attained complete mastery and fulfillment, but space limitations do not allow to include all of them.

Discussion

Thus, such time honoured Ukrainian versions of the translators of the 1960s have undoubtedly established a place in the production of world literature on the international arena. Besides, their translations of prose and poetry created the national school of Ukrainian artistic translation. Its mission is recognized as serving the public by being bound to comply with high quality translations as well as maintaining high professional standards. Because of the rapid growth in the area, particularly in the last decade, certain decisions have had to be taken regarding the selection of the material under translation.
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