

**PERIOD-BOUND RETRANSLATION:  
CHANGES IN THE MACROSTRATEGIES  
OF UKRAINIAN-ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS  
OF 1918–1939 PROSE**

**Serhii Malaiko**

*Ivan Franko National University of Lviv,  
1, Universytetska Str., Lviv, Ukraine, 79000  
serhii.malaiko@gmail.com*

Tendencies in the macrostrategies (domestication and foreignization) concerning translation receive significant attention from the translation studies scholars. A common assumption is that domestication typically precedes all forms of foreignization during the translation of the same literary texts. The main goal of this article is to analyze theoretical material regarding this topic and offer an analysis of the outlined assumption from the standpoint of English translations of Ukrainian prose aimed at the 1918–1939 period. The analysis of the theoretical and practical materials allows proclaiming that the assumptions regarding the transition from domestication to foreignization with the development of national literature are incorrect. Instead, translation macrostrategies change on the basis of objective factors such as ideology. More importantly, they are visible in the case of diverging prose texts with similar ideological topics.

*Key words:* macrostrategy, censorship, retranslation, culture, domestication, foreignization.

**Introduction.** Changes in translation macrostrategies (strategic decisions regarding translation, such as domestication and foreignization of a text) occur on a rather common basis. Some cultures may focus on domestication (target-language-centric translation) for some period and then transition toward foreignization (source-language-centric translation) as the call for greater attention toward outside cultures comes into being. One aspect is clear: no translation methodologies are static; changes are inevitable. The main goal of this article is to reveal the translation methodology changes in the English translations of Ukrainian prose stemming from the 1918–1939 period of the 20th century. This period is notable for vast social transformations and horrifying genocides. Most Ukrainian literature related to it concerns the Soviet Union and relevant pro-socialist claims or, at the very least, some markedly anti-war and, hence, anti-capitalist messages (as World War I was a result of the large capital-related contradictions). Obviously, this ideologically charged period (and rightfully so, considering the Holodomor genocide of Ukrainians, for example) is likely to provoke diverging reactions from translators. In this article, the ideological aspects of translations related to this period receive consideration.

**Previous Research in the Area.** One of the most potent terms relating to the phenomenon analyzed in this paper is the so-called retranslation hypothesis. This framework first appeared in the works of Antoine Berman who based his thinking on the concepts of Schleiermacher, the creator of two basic translation terms, domestication and foreignization. According to this framework, translation methodology often undergoes two periods. Firstly, a nation can be self-focused and, thus, require texts that fit its internal philosophy [20, p. 146–147]. This period necessitates domestication of the relevant material: foreign elements in it disappear to make way for a better understanding of the outsiders by the readers. Secondly, with time, this trend changes significantly, with the involved nations starting to demand a focus on foreign elements. Their main motivation is to learn more about the outside cultures and become richer in terms of the internal knowledge [20, p. 146–147]. Egoism makes way for the desire for knowledge and what one can call ‘translation altruism,’ the attempt to genuinely recognize the essence of other cultures through foreignization.

Berman used all those concepts to study the issue of the so-called second translations. Often, certain literary works or even religious texts undergo a secondary translation that usually disrupts some of their initial trends [20, p. 146–147]. For instance, the Bible is a perfect example of constant retranslation. Various groups continuously strive to remake the translations of the text. As a result, English translations number in dozens if not hundreds belonging to different sects. Ukraine also has several major translations of the Bible performed in diverging manners. Berman believed that the original trend for the first translation is usually domestication. The translators want to make their texts as close to the target culture as possible (rather than vice versa). Later texts move toward being less understandable but more authentic [20, 146–147]. Bible translations at first seek to appeal to the widest audiences. Later trends showcase the appearance of more academic editions.

Many translations also exist for literary works. The *Romance of the Three Kingdoms*, a Chinese epic, showcases the concept of retranslation according to L. Feng [5, p. 69]. It encountered at least two English translations. The first one was domestication-centric, and the second one focused on the creation of a trend for foreignization, striving to showcase the Chinese rather than any other culture. A similar situation came into being in the case of the Croatian translation of William Faulkner’s novel *The Sound and the Fury* [18, p. 37–68].

Nonetheless, skepticism concerning this concept is also present in the current literature. According to S. Razavi & S. Boveiri, the meta-analysis of the retranslation hypothesis literature indicates that only 40 % of the relevant studies confirm the assumptions of Berman [13, p. 1]. 60 % of them refuted the presented concept. According to the researchers, more motivations for the transformations of the relevant texts exist under current conditions. They can include various literary and translation norms, ideology, and even the unique approach of the translator. Considering these data, one can both agree and disagree with Razavi & Boveiri concerning their judgments of the retranslation hypothesis.

On the one hand, it is clear that the strong version of this approach proposed by Berman does not come into being. 60 % of the translations do not follow the expectations stemming from this theory. This means that it needs to be either refuted or rethought in a rather strict manner. On the other hand, it is difficult to discount that the number of texts that confirm the retranslation approach is quite high comprising 40 %. This means that at least the overall

logic of the retranslation hypothesis remains in power. Some changes in retranslation follow the hypothesis of gradual transformations in the relevant approaches. In this light, one should reformulate rather than completely reject the hypothesis of Berman.

This reformulation should take ideological (both personal and collective) aspects into consideration while the overall approach must be less radical in terms of its consequences. In this new paradigm, retranslation may have the following definition: *retranslation is a phenomenon of a methodological change in translation that can (rather than necessarily does) occur during the second and subsequent translations of a certain literary work under the pressure of objective changes in a certain society (for instance, ideology)*. This approach is more flexible than the one proposed by Berman because it does not claim that change must inevitably touch upon the transition from domestication to foreignization. Ideology in different societies can be of such a nature that a reverse process may occur.

Furthermore, modern specialists should also distance themselves from what one may call the moralism of Berman. As Yasin reports, the process of retranslation was seen by Berman and the individuals who followed his approach (Skibinska, for instance) as progress [20, p. 147]. Within this framework, every retranslation becomes a better version of the original. The problem with this methodology is the assignment of qualitative judgments regarding some translations. In the definition presented above, the process of retranslation is essentially ambiguous regarding its impacts.

This paper targets an even more complex concept than that of retranslation. Ukrainian culture, regrettably, is rather obscure in the West (the current political events, the Russian invasion of Ukraine 2022, however, can finally break this trend). For many generations, it was seen as a part of the Russian culture due to the xenophobic propaganda of the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union. In this light, the phenomenon of retranslation is much more difficult to encounter: the attention from the translators is simply low, making every translation quite valuable in nature. Regarding the Ukrainian case, the majority of individuals who translate Ukrainian texts into English have a direct connection to Ukrainian heritage (they are either migrants or their children).

In this regard, one can introduce the notion of 'period-bound retranslation.' This notion follows the framework mentioned above but adds the possibility of diverging translations acting as a part of retranslation for the whole culture rather than one text. *Period-bound retranslation is a phenomenon of a methodological change in the translation of texts from a particular historical period (for instance, the 1918–1939 one) which can (rather than necessarily does) occur during the second and subsequent translations of the same or diverging texts with topics close in terms of overall worldview/images under the pressure of ideological changes in a certain society*.

Sometimes translators may go for diverging texts but touch upon the same periods and topics engaging in the phenomenon of retranslation. In this article, the antimilitary and pro-socialist/pro-left ideological components will receive the attention of the author.

Before analyzing English translations of Ukrainian prose, it is also crucial to review studies that pay attention to this phenomenon. In this regard, a seminal text is undoubtedly *Realia and Translation* (1989) by Prof. Zorivchak. The presented analysis perfected the notion of realia based on Ukrainian-English translations [21]. This book proves that the

reviewed phenomenon is highly productive: the differences between Ukrainian and American cultures are significant enough to highlight a large set of circumstances that impact translation. An even more detailed review of the English translations of Ukrainian prose and poetry appears in the article of Prof. Zorivchak titled “Українсько-англійські літературні взаємини” (“Ukrainian-English literary contacts”) [22, p. 28–141]. One can find it in a collection of articles and recollections about Prof. Zorivchak titled *Зорівчак Р. З любов'ю до науки і життя* (Zorivchak R. *With love towards science and life*).

Post-USSR research also features multiple texts that deal with the issues of Ukrainian-English translations. Several major pieces of research touching upon the English translations of Ukrainian prose belong to Prof. L. Kolomiets from Taras Shevchenko Kyiv National University. She was actively researching the translations of Vera Rich in the 2010s. In this regard, her 2013 study titled “Рецепція англомовних перекладів поезій Тараса Шевченка інтернет-читачами (огляд читацьких відгуків та коментарів)” (“Reception of English translations of Taras Shevchenko poetry by readers online (a study on reader reviews and commentaries)”) uses a qualitative methodology to study how readers perceive English translations of Ukrainian texts [23]. A summary of Vera Rich’s translation efforts appears in a 2018 article on the topic. It is titled “Taras Shevchenko translated and retranslated by Vera Rich: A lifelong search for poetic perfection” [6]. Apart from translation-oriented studies, Prof. Kolomiets also researches Soviet translation and Ukrainian prose of the 1920s and 1930s. For example, she published an article on the writings of V. Pidmohilnyi and M. Khvylovyi [24].

Detailed research of English translations of Ukrainian prose, many of which touch upon the Soviet totalitarian period that is the key target of this article’s author, is present in a Ph.D. dissertation of a researcher from Taras Shevchenko Kyiv National University, B. Pliushch. Another notable fact is that her scientific supervisor was the aforementioned Prof. Kolomiets. The title of the dissertation is “Прямий та непрямий переклад української художньої прози англійською, німецькою, іспанською та російською мовами” (“Direct and indirect recreation of Ukrainian fictional prose in English, German, Spanish, and Russian translations”). B. Pliushch’s research touches upon the different strategies of translation employed within English, German, Spanish, and Russian recreations of Ukrainian prose [26]. From the standpoint of the present study, a notable element of the research is the review of translations of Ivan Bahriany’s prose. George Luckyj, who receives attention in this article, is the translator of *The Hunters and the Hunted* (*Тигролови*) into English. Thus, this and other papers of the author add to the existing volume of knowledge on the translations performed by George Luckyj.

Methodologically, an interesting review of English translations of Ukrainian texts appears in an article titled “До історії видання українських дум у перекладі англійською мовою: фрагмент листування Юрія Луцького з Юрієм Тарнавським” (“Adding to the history of publishing Ukrainian dumas in English: fragments of correspondence between George Luckyj and Yuriy Tarnawsky.”) [25]. This article reviews the ‘behind the scenes’ processes of the duma translation project. In this way, it highlights the undiscussed issues of translation methodology.

**Methodology.** Methodologically, this paper bases itself on two theoretical frameworks. Firstly, it focuses on the overall theory of human motivation and human nature. The author has serious reasons to believe that a significant factor in human behavior remains close to the biological constants [1, p. 852–854; 4, p. 19–59]. From a methodological perspective, this paper rejects the common leftist assumption that humans have no definite nature. Instead, it adopts the belief that human needs are primarily innate: society modifies their manifestation but never modifies the needs themselves. Those needs include nutrition, social contacts, safety from physical threats, and procreation (the list is not exhaustive).

Every person strives to adapt to certain conditions in society to survive within it and fulfill their needs. In practice, this means that personal actions usually revolve around the ideology of a particular society. In socialism, a dissident will try to hide their affiliation and promote covert ideas aimed at criticizing the system with the goal to create a society that offers a better chance of adaptation for them. At the same time, a loyalist will either support this society unquestioningly or offer constructive criticism with an aim to preserve and strengthen their environment. Every person, thus, acts according to their best interests in such systems. Moral values and ideology serve as an outward manifestation of those interests.

This factor also touches upon translations. An average translator has many reasons to engage in similar behavior. They may censor some ideas, for example, to defend the ‘socialist motherland’ or preserve the ‘religious purity of the Ukrainian nation.’ A translator, as D. Simeoni claims, will adhere to the translation norms of their society to become popular [16, p. 1–39]. These conclusions call for the analysis of the environments in which the translators live and of their ideology. One should look at the biographies of the individuals and, more importantly, the things they say about their overall goals in translation. In this way, one can unveil the ideological changes in society and highlight whether the period-bound retranslation came into being by considering its focus on the ideas.

This disposition also calls for another important conclusion: no translations are without an ideology behind them. Current research literature confirms these assumptions. Translations in the Soviet Union, as some researchers claim, were essentially weaponized [3, p. 411–415]. Their goal was to serve the dictatorship of the proletariat by relaying the ideas that were crucial for raising the future ‘builders of communism.’ Hence, a large number of censorship cases occurred in the country: it, more or less, focused on banning any idea that went against its ideological canon. Censorship also came into being in the West due to either the Nazi legacy of Germany or the sexist environment [2, p. 183–192; 10, p. 59–73]. This phenomenon touched upon the disruption of ideas in the early German translations of Anne Franke’s diary or the removal of philosophical content from Simone de Beauvoir’s *Second Sex* treatise.

Secondly, another vital focus of the present paper is on the linguoconceptual and Cognitive Linguistics terms. These frameworks are essential for offering a perfect basis regarding the comparisons of translation ideologies in different periods. The theories of George Lakoff are especially enticing in this regard. The researcher claimed that humans tend to formulate most of their terms on the basis of either bodily feelings or the concepts that derive from them [9, p. 202–210]. One of the key achievements stemming from this

research is undoubtedly the creation of the notation for various concepts. For instance, Lakoff proposes to highlight the concept of time and its relation to money in the following manner: Time = Money [9, p. 202–210]. This method is a perfect framework for outlining the ideological motivations in certain texts. It has a positive reception among translation studies scholars [14, p. 1253–1269].

**Analysis.** For the purposes of this article, fragments from the translations of the 1918–1939 literature made by G. Luckyj and M. Luckyj, A. Mykytiak, and Yuriy Tkach will appear. Special emphasis will involve the translation of *Bayhorod* by Yuriy Yanovskyi (Yuriy Tkach spells his last name as Yanovsky; this spelling is reflected in the references to prevent problems with finding the relevant source – *S. M.*) performed by Yuriy Tkach. This sample list allows one to offer a more or less complete understanding of the approaches that translators in diverging eras take regarding the issue of English translations into Ukrainian.

#### *Pre-Repression/Pre-Cold War Translations (the 1930s)*

The primary centralized efforts to translate Ukrainian literature into English started to arise after World War I. One of the most notable translations from this period belongs to Andriy Mykytiak, who translated the poetic short story of Osyp Turianskyi titled *Lost Shadows* (*Поша межамі болю*). This translation is notable for offering a highly literal approach to rendering the key information, breaking the traditional paradigm of Berman regarding the domestication elements. The analysis of the attitude to the concept of God performed by the author of this research in another article shows that even this rather disputed notion (from the standpoint of the 1918–1939 period zeitgeist) received an almost literal translation. In general, God becomes the source of injustice and even evil both in the original of the prosaic poem and its translation (God = Source of Injustice, God = Source of Evil) [29, p. 1–173; 17, p. 1–246].

Changes in the images are definitely present in some other cases but they are minor and do not involve a direct ideological influence, likely being a result of the pragmatic choices. The main aspect of the short story, its anti-war message, is preserved. In fact, the translator goes so far in recreating the messages that he loses some of the poetic qualities of the original. This information indicates that foreignization is an absolutely central translation program in the outlined case.

The preface to the story also confirms these assumptions. It indicates that the translator strived to recreate the material close to the original and even sought to recreate some of the grammar peculiarities of the original (the common use of the Present Tense). More importantly, a focus on foreignization is present in this paratext: the translator highlights that the Ukrainian culture is highly different in comparison to the Russian one, indicating the need to prepare for an alternative vision of the world [17, p. 7–9]. Andriy Mykytiak was personally acquainted with Osyp Turianskyi and, as a result, strived to recreate his story close to the original. An interesting factor is that Mykytiak also noted that he wanted to recreate the prosaic poem in a way that adhered to the demands of the American public. Considering the foreignizing attitude, this means that the framework was highly popular among the majority of the readers at the time (Translation = Foreignization = Close Adherence to Original).

*Cold War (1945 to 1991)*

One of the most notable translators of the literary works stemming from the 1918–1939 period is George Luckyj, who often worked in cooperation with his wife Moira on the translations of Ukrainian texts from that period. He is behind at least several translations from that time. Among the most important translations is the recreation of *A little touch of drama* (*Невеличка драма*) by V. Pidmohilnyi (George Luckyj spells his last name as Pidmohilny; as a result, while this paper mostly uses ‘Pidmoilnyi’ as a more appropriate variant, direct quotes and one of the references uses this spelling – *S. M.*). In general, the translation strives to be close to the original. The vast part of its fragments is translated word-for-word if compared with the original. Some divergences, however, allow claiming that elements of domestication and ideological erasure of the Soviet experience came into being.

Above all, one should note the preface of a *Little touch of drama* and the attached review of George Shevelov that summarizes its plot and offers an insight into its philosophical and political ideas. Regarding the preface by George Luckyj, it clearly showcases the ideological charge of the translator [12, p. 7–8]. He concentrates on describing the story of the novel, emphasizing the fact that it was banned in the Soviet Union, and then transitions to the fate of Pidmohilnyi, who died, according to him, in a “concentration camp.” Additionally, the preface laments that Western readers often ignore Ukrainian literature due to the imperial influence of Russia (and its inheritor, the Soviet Union). All these facts appear prior to any thoughts on translation, showing that the translator strived to show a clearly anti-Soviet nature of the novel. After all, it was banned in the Soviet Union and the author died for trying to publish the text. In the end, George Luckyj calls the novel ‘sardonic’ and claims that he tried to translate it close to the original but without the emphasis on the explanation of all complex terms through footnotes. In short, a focus is on the comfort of the reader and, therefore, at least a moderate level of domestication arises.

The preface by George Shevelov is also of interest. It involves a clear ideological choice on the part of the translator. Apart from explaining the plot of the novel, this text is also notable regarding its conclusions related to the anti-Soviet nature of the novel. At first, George Shevelov openly denies that Pidmohilnyi wanted to write an anti-Soviet text by default. He even calls the text in question apolitical. Slightly later in the review, however, he makes a much bolder statement.

“Pidmohilny’s (spelling according to Prof. Shevelov and George Luckyj – *S. M.*) work has nothing to do with political pamphlets. But it has a lot to do with Ukrainian literature. Its place is among the intellectual, ironic novels of the late 1920s with which Ukrainian literature greeted the technological era and its political prelude in the USSR, the terror of the 1930s. Yohansen’s *Podorozh doktora Leonarda* (*The Journey of Dr. Leonardo*) and Domontovych’s *Doktor Serafikus* are novels of this type” [12, p. 15].

Essentially, Shevelov (and Luckyj, who included his review in the preface) believe that the whole Ukrainian literature of the early Soviet era was rather anti-Soviet. This information alone allows saying that a significant reason for some distortions and biases was present. In Lakoff’s notation, one can highlight these factors in this way: Ukrainian

Culture = Anti-Soviet, Soviet Union = Always Totalitarian. Pidmohilnyi's novel, in reality, was not in any way anti-Soviet. It positively showcased the local symbols and institutions. For Pidmohilnyi, Ukrainian Culture was at least left-wing (Ukrainian Culture = Left-wing) and Soviet Union = A Promising State. He showcased some irony for certain ideological issues but it is difficult to call this factor openly negative in the case. The attack against some of the anti-nature claims of the main characters has a clear aim of preventing a totalitarian future for the Soviet Union. The criticism is constructive. As for the changes introduced by Luckyj, they are not surprising: Communists killed his father [15].

The analysis of the text indeed reveals some changes. Firstly, one should note that many of the Soviet terms were translated not in the way they appeared in the novel. To make the reading of the material easier for the relevant readers, the translator engaged in the domestication of many Sovietisms (words created by the Soviet government). This tendency also continues in other translations of George Luckyj. In *Boat in the sea* (*Шаланда в морі*), short story by Y. Yanovskyi, the term *артіль* is translated as *cooperative* [11, p. 166–167]. This translation tendency is also present in *A little touch of drama*. The problem with the translation is that it does not look into the nuances of the relevant terms. Indeed, the notion represents a cooperative; however, it has unique economic characteristics that differentiate it from the more traditional understanding of the term. An *артіль* is a combination between the craftsman guilds and cooperatives since it typically involves the cooperation of people belonging to one profession. This cooperation is also small-scale. A cooperative can take the form of a large business such as the Spanish *Mondragon Corporation*, where people do radically different tasks.

Shortened terms and Sovietisms of various kinds also encounter a simplification: *махорпецт*, for instance, becomes a *Tobacco Trust* [12, p. 19]. A clear tendency toward simplification is present in the outlined case. One can say that the translator strived to simplify the Soviet reality to make it less unique. A disdain for some of its ideological forms is present (Soviet Reality = Negative).

Secondly, at least two omissions of highly ideological fragments mentioning the criticism of Christianity and the positive attitude to red banners and worker demonstrations occur. A conflict between the translator's vision (Christianity = Positive, Soviet Symbols = Negative) and that of the author (Christianity = Negative; Soviet Symbols = Positive) is present [12, p. 1–191; 27, p. 539–742]. These changes are a result of censorship on the part of the 1956 version editors, who had a strong right-wing bias, and the de facto agreement of the translator with the anti-leftist parts of their program [28].

Lastly, one should also note that some terms related to sexual activities were more obscure in the original of the novel. At least one of them received a direct nomination in the translation despite the use of euphemisms in the original. Such directness is not characteristic of Ukrainian culture. It is obvious that Ukrainian culture features a rather reserved attitude to such activities (Ukrainian Attitude to Romantic/Sexual Activities = Reserved). The domesticated translation, however, seems to be much more open (American Attitude to Romantic/Sexual Activities = Relatively Open):

**Original:** *За юнацьких років, він, як і чимало юнаків, задовольняє свої молоді потреби самотійно, а до жінок почував страх і зневагу* [27, p. 574].



**Literal Translation of the Original:** *During his youth, he, like many teens, used to fulfill his youthful needs independently, feeling fear and disdain regarding women.*

**Translation by G. and M. Luckyj:** *When he was a youth, he had satisfied it like so many others, by masturbation, and he felt fear and contempt for women [12, p. 48].*

All these factors enable one to proclaim that major transformations occurred in the novel. Firstly, it underwent changes of domesticating nature. Some of the terms became simpler to fit the needs of the audience. The use of footnotes is also minimal. Secondly, one should note that the preface clearly creates a biased (whether this bias is positive or not is not of interest to the author of this article; all biases are generally neutral from the adopted interest-based sociology) vision of the novel, highlighting its anti-Soviet/anti-rationalist nature. As a result, the neutral and even pro-Soviet original (the Soviet Union = Generally Positive Values) (considering the references to red flags and atheism) becomes rather anti-Soviet due to such changes (the Soviet Union = Negativity). A clear case of literary manipulation becoming a dominant norm occurs.

#### *Modern Period (Post-1991): Increasing Distance Regarding the Totalitarian Space*

Translations that show significant changes in the paradigm of translation toward the original impartiality belong to Yuriy Tkach. For the purposes of this article, a short story titled *Bayhorod* (author: Yuriy Yanovskyi) and its recent (2018) translation are of interest. This translation is notable for two main factors.

The first one is the preface of the translation prepared by Marko Pavlyshyn, which apparently was openly approved by the translator. It seems to be genuinely unbiased in nature. The author shows no ideological fervor in the outlined case. Firstly, the initial fragment describes the history of Ukraine in the early 20th century in non-ideological terms. No emotionally-colored words related to the fall of the Ukrainian People's Republic, for instance, are present [19, p. 7–12]. The victory of the Soviets and the subsequent Ukrainization appear in a rather subdued and historic light. Secondly, it primarily concentrates on the story of Y. Yanovskyi and his career in the Soviet Union. References to the repressions in the system exist but they appear to bear no ideological bias and appear in a rather academic format [19, p. 7–12]. Some of the key names of the people related to the Executed Renaissance are present but no major judgment is attached to them. The only slightly ideological claim appears at the end when the author of the preface highlights the need for Yanovskyi to adapt to the authoritarian nature of the Soviets [19, p. 7–12]. Still, one cannot call this fragment too ideological because even Stalinist Marxists often admit that socialism tends to be dictatorial. From the standpoint of Lakoff's theory, Soviet Union = Neutral in this preface.

As for the second major factor, it stems from the translation method chosen for the outlined short story. One of the most notable aspects in the translation is how literal it appears. Out of 78 fragments from the story chosen by the author of this article, none show significant detractions from the original or attempts to domesticate. Only 2 or 3 controversial cases exist but even they may be a result of some random factors rather than a direct translation policy. When faced with some old Slavonic texts, Y. Tkach uses footnotes. For all other fragments, the translation appears highly literal in nature (Translation Method

= Foreignization). Almost no changes in images appear. Structure changes but only to better recreate images. One of the fragments below can perfectly highlight the shown factors:

1) **Original:** *Він немилосердно поливатиме свої затишні вулиці, падаючи від ран, і дивним мереживом висітиме над ним весняне небо* [30, p. 255].

**Translation:** *The day will mercilessly drench the quiet streets with blood, as the wounded fall to the ground, and the spring sky will hang above in a weird broidery* [19, p. 18].

In this case, some changes related to the clarity of the text do occur, explicating certain fragments of the original. Nonetheless, they are very minor, with the main image being almost unchanged. There are structural changes, indeed, but no major image-related transformations. One should pay special attention to broidery. In this case, the rather Ukrainian phrase related to its national tradition of embroidery, which is not present in such a capacity within the English-speaking nations, comes to the fore. *Weird broidery* fully transitions to the translation. In this case, the Sky = Weird Broidery = Embroidery metaphor is identical in both the original and translation.

2) One of the fragments involves strong references to the Russian language and an anarchist song by Bakunin in it:

**Original:** *Споемте же песню под гром и удары,  
Под взрывы снарядов, под пламя пожаров...* [30, p. 278].

Many translations, including the aforementioned one by George and Moira Luckyj never highlight the presence of the Russian language in the relevant texts. Pidmohilnyi's characters often speak either it or the Ukrainian-Russian language mixture (surzhyk) but no references to them appear in the relevant texts. Yuriy Tkach, contrary to that, gives a footnote regarding the fragment, explaining its anarchist origin, and directly says that the element is in Russian despite the English translation [19, p. 75]. In the translation of G. and M. Luckuj, the Russian influence is obscured (Russian Influence = Irrelevant). In the one by Y. Tkach, it comes to the fore (Russian Influence = Relevant).

The trends outlined in these fragments continue throughout the entire text. Despite some small structural changes (for instance, regarding certain Sovietism-like contractions, which were not central to the short story and do not distort the original terms significantly), it involves a highly significant level of similarity. The translation is almost literal (apart from small structural fragments, which bear no significance to the original sense), often recreating almost every aspect of the images that appear in the original short story of Yanovskyi (Translation = Foreignization).

**Results and Discussion.** The presented examples show that a clear change in the translation culture came into being. Period-bound retranslation changes manifested at least two times in the outlined case. The first change of this type occurred between 1945 and the 1980s/1990s when a clear anti-Soviet/anti-left ideological fervor and a focus on domestication came into being. It removed the rather foreignized and difference-centric translation of the earlier period. Translators such as George Luckyj strived to offer texts that were convenient for Western audiences in both the reading and ideological sense. This factor even comes into being regarding the translations outside of the 1918–1939 period. *Black Council* (Panteleimon Kulish) translation made during World War II by S. Shumeyko

was much more literal than the one performed by George Luckyj later in the 1960s, which featured abridgments that removed up to 20 % of the overall text [7; 8]. Lastly, the current period clearly features a return to more impartial translations. It is clear that attempts for the more foreignized and emotionally distant (regarding the reader) versions of the texts appear in the outlined case, as evidenced by the translations of Y. Tkach.

One of the key reasons for the more impartial translations of the Soviet and near-socialist arguments lies in the change of the objective reality regarding international politics. Firstly, as the analysis of the translator biographies shows, a strong temporal distance from the repressions occurring in the Soviet Union exists. Likely, many children and grandchildren of immigrants in Canada and the U.S. are the offspring of people who ran away from repressions in the Soviet Union. As long as their direct relatives survived or were distant from the translators despite some tragic events, this factor started to play a decreased role in translation. Temporal or emotional distance makes the analysis of personal tragedies in families possible.

Secondly, the juggernaut that was behind the Holodomor genocide and the Executed Renaissance, Soviet Union, is no longer the direct enemy of Ukrainians simply because it does not exist and the ideology behind it, Communism, appears to be discredited (at least for now; what would happen in half a century of the rather conflicted capitalist development is dubious). The true enemy of Ukrainians is capitalist Russia, which is ideologically distant from the Soviet Union. Modern Russia is radically different from the Soviet Union in many senses apart from its aggressive emphasis on the need to conquer Ukraine.

The Soviet Union went as far as world domination, with Ukraine being one of the targets. Russia wants control over Eastern Europe, with Ukraine being a part of its panslavism dominance equation. It is capitalist, oligarchic, and often markedly anti-Soviet (apart from the 9th of May celebrations and the parasitic usage of the red flags which are among the symbols of victory in World War II). The Russian President openly quotes a notable Russian fascist Illin, who voiced support for Nazi Germany during the 1930s–1940s and ‘miraculously’ changed his opinion on Nazis only after their crimes became evident. One can conclude that Russian ideology of today is close to that of its internal fascist movements such as the infamous Black Hundreds.

This factor makes translation of the Soviet-era texts easier as they no longer represent a direct threat regarding the ideological subversion of the younger generations. It is likely behind the highlighted growth in the impartiality of the analyzed translation by Y. Tkach. When the Soviet Union was a direct enemy of Ukrainians, many translators were willing to show it in a negative light to adapt the environment to their needs (the restoration of independent Ukraine). Prior to the revelation of the repressions in the Soviet Union, no attempts to undermine ideas related to it occurred due to the lack of antagonism with a focus on the foreignizing showcase of the Ukrainian culture.

**Conclusion.** Ultimately, the presented analysis clearly shows that the period-bound retranslation as a concept can be a legitimate term. On the basis of three translations from diverging periods, it highlights the change in the attitude to left-wing topics and Soviet Union. This observation enables one to proclaim that ideological changes can genuinely transform the nature of translations. There is no limit to them, just as there is no limit to

the retranslations. Indeed, the domestication/foreignization line outlined by Berman does not exist. Changes in translation methodology depend on the dominating ideology of a society. As for the limitations of this research, its main obstacle involves a focus on three translations. To make more generalizable statements regarding the researched period, a much larger sample is crucial. The author plans to offer such analysis in their Ph.D. dissertation, delivering a more general overview of the outlined topic.

## REFERENCES

1. Balady G. J. Survival of the fittest – more evidence. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2002. Vol. 346, no. 11. P. 852–854.
2. Bogic A. Uncovering the hidden actors with the help of Latour: the ‘making’ of *The Second Sex*. *MonTi: monografias de traducción e interpretación*. 2010. No. 2. P. 173–192.
3. Chernetsky V. A battle for translation. *Translation under Communism*. Cham, 2022. P. 411–441.
4. Fallatah R. H. M., Syed J. A critical review of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. *Employee Motivation in Saudi Arabia*. Cham, 2017. P. 19–59.
5. Feng L. Retranslation hypotheses revisited: A case study of two English translations of “Sanguo Yanyi” – the first Chinese novel. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus*. 2014. Vol. 43. P. 69.
6. Kolomiyets L. Taras Shevchenko translated and retranslated by Vera Rich: A lifelong search for poetic perfection. *Respectus Philologicus*. 2018. Vol. 34, no. 39.
7. Kulish P. *Black council*. Littleton CO : Ukrainian Academic Press, 1973. 125 p.
8. Kulish P. *Black council*. Ukrainian Weekly.
9. Lakoff G. The contemporary theory of metaphor. *Metaphor and Thought*. 1993. P. 202–251.
10. Lefevere A. *Translation, rewriting, and the manipulation of literary fame*. London : Routledge, 1992. 176 p.
11. Luckyj G. *Modern Ukrainian short stories*. 2nd ed. Englewood : Ukrainian Academic Press, 1995. 230 p.
12. Pidmohilny V. *A little touch of drama / trans. from Ukrainian by G. Luckyj, M. Luckyj*. Ukrainian Academic Press, 1972. 191 p.
13. Razavi S., Boveiri S. A meta-analytical critique of Antoine Berman’s retranslation hypothesis. *Translation Theories*. 2019.
14. Schäffner C. Metaphor and translation: some implications of a cognitive approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 2004. Vol. 36, no. 7. P. 1253–1269.
15. Senkus R., Luckyj G., Nestor S. *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*. URL: <http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages\L\U\LuckyjGeorgeStephenNestor.htm>.
16. Simeoni D. The pivotal status of the translator’s habitus. *Target*. 1998. Vol. 10, no. 1. P. 1–39.
17. Turianskyi O. *Lost shadows*. New York : Empire Books, 1935. 246 p.
18. Vraneković M. Testing the retranslation hypothesis: A case study of William Faulkner’s *The Sound and the Fury*. *Hieronymus : časopis za istraživanja prevodenja i terminologije*. 2021. Vol. 7. P. 37–68.
19. Yanovsky Y. *Bayhorod*. Melbourne : Bayda Books, 2018. 108 p.
20. Yasin A. H. Antoine Berman on retranslation. *International Journal of English and Education*. 2019. Vol. 8, no. 2. P. 145–153.

21. Zorivchak R. P. Realiia i pereklad [Realia and Translation]. Lviv : Vyd-vo pry LNU, 1989. 216 s.
22. Zorivchak R. Ukrainsko-anhliiski literaturni vziaimyny [Ukrainian-English literary connections]. Zorivchak R. Z liuboviu do nauky i zhyttia. Lviv, 2021. S. 28–141.
23. Kolomiets L. Retseptsiia anhlovnykh perekladiv poezii Tarasa Shevchenka inter-net-chytachamy (ohliad chytatskykh vidhukiv ta komentariv) [Reception of English translations of Taras Shevchenko's poetry by Internet readers (the review of readers' responses and comments)]. *Shevchenkoznavchi studii*. 2013. № 16. S. 291–303.
24. Kolomiets L. Ukrainskyi renesans u poshukakh indyvidualnosti (M. Khvylovyi i V. Pidmohylnyi) [Ukrainian renaissance in search of individuality ((M. Khvylovyi i V. Pidmohylnyi)]. *Slovo i chas*. 1992. № 10. S. 64–70.
25. Luchuk O. Do istorii vydannia ukrainskykh dum u perekladi anhliiskoiu movoiu: frahment lystuvannia Yuriiia Lutskoho z Yuriem Tarnavskym [To the history of publication of Ukrainian duma in English translation: A fragment from correspondence between Yu. Lutsyi and Yu. Tarnavskiy]. *Mifolohiia i folklor*. № 3–4.
26. Pliushch B. Priamyi ta nepriamyi pereklad ukrainskoi khudozhnoi prozy anhliiskoiu, nimetskoiu, ispanskoiu ta rosiiskoiu movamy [Direct and indirect translation of Ukrainian fiction into English, German, Spanish and Russian]: dys. na zdobuttia vchenoho stupenia kandydata filolohichnykh nauk. Kyiv, 2016. 220 s.
27. Pidmohylnyi V. Nevelychka drama [A Small Drama]. Valerian Pidmohylnyi. Opovidannia. Povist. Romany. Kyiv, 1991. S. 539–742.
28. Pidmohylnyi V. Nevelychka drama [A Small Drama]. Paryzh : Vyd. Pershoi Ukr. Druk. u Frantsii, 1956. 342 p.
29. Turianskyi O. Poza mezhamy bolii: kartyna z bezodni [Outside Pain: a Picture from the Abyss]. Viden, Avstriia : Ukr. Myst. Naklad. i Knyhar., 1921. 173 s.
30. Yanovskyi Yu. Opovidannia. Romany. Piesy [Stories. Novels. Plays]. Kyiv : Nauk. Dumka, 1984.

## СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНОЇ ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

1. Balady G. J. Survival of the fittest – more evidence. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2002. Vol. 346, no. 11. P. 852–854.
2. Bogic A. Uncovering the hidden actors with the help of Latour: the ‘making’ of The Second Sex. *MonTi: monografias de traducción e interpretación*. 2010. No. 2. P. 173–192.
3. Chernetsky V. A battle for translation. *Translation under Communism*. Cham, 2022. P. 411–441.
4. Fallatah R. H. M., Syed J. A critical review of Maslow's hierarchy of needs. *Employee Motivation in Saudi Arabia*. Cham, 2017. P. 19–59.
5. Feng L. Retranslation hypotheses revisited: A case study of two English translations of “Sanguo Yanyi” – the first Chinese novel. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus*. 2014. Vol. 43. P. 69.
6. Kolomyets L. Taras Shevchenko translated and retranslated by Vera Rich: A lifelong search for poetic perfection. *Respectus Philologicus*. 2018. Vol. 34, no. 39.
7. Kulish P. Black council. Littleton CO : Ukrainian Academic Press, 1973. 125 p.
8. Kulish P. Black council. *Ukrainian Weekly*.
9. Lakoff G. The contemporary theory of metaphor. *Metaphor and Thought*. 1993. P. 202–251.
10. Lefevere A. Translation, rewriting, and the manipulation of literary fame. London : Routledge, 1992. 176 p.

11. Luckyj G. *Modern Ukrainian short stories*. 2nd ed. Englewood : Ukrainian Academic Press, 1995. 230 p.
12. Pidmohilny V. *A little touch of drama* / trans. from Ukrainian by G. Luckyj, M. Luckyj. Ukrainian Academic Press, 1972. 191 p.
13. Razavi S., Boveiri S. A meta-analytical critique of Antoine Berman's retranslation hypothesis. *Translation Theories*. 2019.
14. Schäffner C. Metaphor and translation: some implications of a cognitive approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 2004. Vol. 36, no. 7. P. 1253–1269.
15. Senkus R., Luckyj G., Nestor S. *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*. URL: <http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages\L\U\LuckyjGeorgeStephenNestor.htm>.
16. Simeoni D. The pivotal status of the translator's habitus. *Target*. 1998. Vol. 10, no. 1. P. 1–39.
17. Turianskyi O. *Lost shadows*. New York : Empire Books, 1935. 246 p.
18. Vraneković M. Testing the retranslation hypothesis: A case study of William Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury*. *Hieronymus : časopis za istraživanja prevodenja i terminologije*. 2021. Vol. 7. P. 37–68.
19. Yanovsky Y. *Bayhorod*. Melbourne : Bayda Books, 2018. 108 p.
20. Yasin A. H. Antoine Berman on retranslation. *International Journal of English and Education*. 2019. Vol. 8, no. 2. P. 145–153.
21. Зорівчак Р. П. Реалія і переклад. Львів : Вид-во при ЛНУ, 1989. 216 с.
22. Зорівчак Р. Українсько-англійські літературні взаємини. *Зорівчак Р. З любов'ю до науки і життя*. Львів, 2021. С. 28–141.
23. Коломієць Л. Рецепція англomовних перекладів поезій Тараса Шевченка інтернет-читачами (огляд читацьких відгуків та коментарів). *Шевченкознавчі студії*. 2013. № 16. С. 291–303.
24. Коломієць Л. Український ренесанс у пошуках індивідуальності (М. Хвильовий і В. Підмогильний). *Слово і час*. 1992. № 10. С. 64–70.
25. Лучук О. До історії видання українських дум у перекладі англійською мовою: фрагмент листування Юрія Луцького з Юрієм Тарнавським. *Міфологія і фольклор*. № 3–4.
26. Плющ Б. Прямий та непрямий переклад української художньої прози англійською, німецькою, іспанською та російською мовами : дис. ... канд. філол. наук. Київ, 2016. 220 с.
27. Підмогильний В. Невеличка драма. *Валер'ян Підмогильний. Оповідання. Повість. Романи*. Київ, 1991. С. 539–742.
28. Підмогильний В. Невеличка драма. Париж : Вид. Першої укр. друк. у Франції, 1956. 342 с.
29. Турянський О. *Поза межами болю: картина з безодні*. Відень, Австрія : Укр. мист. наклад. і книгар., 1921. 173 с.
30. Яновський Ю. *Оповідання. Романи. П'єси*. Київ : Наукова Думка, 1984.

Стаття надійшла до редколегії 19.09.2023

Прийнята до друку 14.10.2023

## ПЕРІОДО-ОРІЄНТОВАНА РЕТРАНСЛЯЦІЯ: ЗМІНИ В МАКРОСТРАТЕГІЇ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ УКРАЇНОМОВНОЇ ПРОЗИ, НАПИСАНОЇ МІЖ 1918 І 1939 РОКАМИ

Сергій Малайко

*Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка,  
вул. Університетська, 1, м. Львів, Україна, 79000  
serhii.malaiko@gmail.com*

Тенденції в макростратегіях (доместикація і форенізація) перекладу отримують значну увагу від учених у галузі перекладознавства. Спроби знайти історичні закони розвитку перекладу логічні, оскільки такі закони можуть полегшити дослідження історії перекладів і перекладознавства. Загальним припущенням є те, що доместикація зазвичай передує всім формам форенізації під час перекладу певного літературного твору. Наприклад, перші переклади Біблії в модерні часи брали за основу народну мову. Наразі навпаки існує більший акцент на буквальный переклад і версії зі значною кількістю зносок. Основна мета статті – проаналізувати теоретичного матеріал з цієї теми і надати аналізу вищезазначеного припущення з погляду англійських перекладів української прози, спрямованих на період з 1918 по 1939 роки. Аналіз теоретичних і практичних матеріалів дає змогу стверджувати, що припущення щодо переходу від доместикації до форенізації з розвитком національної літератури є неправильним. Замість цього макростратегії перекладу змінюються на основі об'єктивних чинників, таких, як ідеологія. Що ще важливіше, ці зміни помітні у різних прозових текстах зі схожими ідеологічними темами. У випадку з англійськими перекладами української літератури це дослідження дозволило встановити, що підходи до перекладу мінялись під впливом об'єктивних причин, таких, як зміна ідеології. Як показує реальний матеріал, один з перших англійських перекладів української прози англійською (*Поза межами болю* Осипа Турянського) був форенізаційним. Водночас переклади часів Холодної війни мали більше елементів доместикації. Зрештою, сучасні переклади знову повертаються до об'єктивного відтворення радянської дійсності і лівої ідеології. У випадку перекладів Юрія Яновського, виконаних Юрієм Ткачем, було встановлено, що перекладач займав доволі нейтральну позицію стосовно ідеологічних питань. Вірогідно, це пов'язано з розпадом Радянського Союзу: з появою загрози у формі капіталістичної та імперіалістичної Росії, перекладачі можуть більш об'єктивно аналізувати радянську дійсність.

*Ключові слова:* макростратегія, цензура, ретрансляція, культура, доместикація, форенізація.